DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 248 804 HE 017 672

TITLE	Defense Intelligence: Foreign Area/Language Needs and Academe.
INSTITUTION	SRI International, Menlo Park, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Association of American Colleges, Washington, D.C.; Department of the Army, Washington, D.C. Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence.
PUB DATE	Oct 83
NOTE	126p.
PUB TYPE	Statistical Data (110) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Area Studies; Armed Forces; Cooperative Programs; *Foreign Diplomats; *Government School Relationship; Higher Education; International Relations; Job Skills; *Labor Needs; *Military Schools; National Defense; Questionnaires; *Second Language Instruction; World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS	Defense Language Institute; *Department Of Defense; National Security Agency

ABSTRACT

The Department of Defense's (DOD) need for foreign language/area expertise was assessed, along with opportunities for the academic community to supplement government training. In addition to interviewing intelligence managers, questionnaires were administered to defense analysts to determine their background, training, and use of external resources related to foreign language and area studies. Information is provided on: intelligence tasks that require language capability; language training within the Defense Language Institute (DIA); the coding of language skills among the armed services and DIA; and the need for area specialists by the Army and the other service branches. Direct and indirect relations between the defense intelligence community and the academic world are considered, along with attitudes of the defense intelligence community toward academia and vice versa. Cooperative programs with academia are described, including those of the National Security Agency, as well as the General Defense Intelligence Program--Third World Language and Area Studies Initiative; and the OSD Sponsored Soviet and Eastern European Language and Area Studies Program. Appended are questionnaires and data on DOD's foreign language requirements and capabilities for funding year 1982-1984. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED248804

DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE: FOREIGN AREA/LANGUAGE NEEDS AND ACADEME

October 1983

Prepared for:

The Association of American Universities
Washington, D.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

SRI Project 5884

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

AAU

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SRI International-Washington
1611 North Kent Street
Arlington, Virginia 22209

HE017672

DEFENSE INTELLIGENCE: FOREIGN AREA/LANGUAGE NEEDS AND ACADEME

October 1983

Prepared for:

The Association of American Universities
Washington, D.C.

SRI Project 5884

Approved by:

Dr. William B. Bader
Vice President
SRI International-Washington

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. INTRODUCTION.. 1

II. METHODOLOGY AND RECOMMENDATIONS.......................... 7

III. THE SYSTEM: FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND AREA SPECIALIZATION IN THE DOD INTELLIGENCE FIELD................. 10

- A. Language... 14
  - 1. Language Use.. 14
  - 2. Language Training................................... 16
  - 3. Language Coding, Maintenance and Availability.... 21
- B. Area Training.. 27
- C. Area Specialist Utilization............................ 31

IV. ACADEMIC RELATIONS..................................... 32

- A. Direct Relations....................................... 33
- B. Indirect Support....................................... 34
- C. Attitudes Toward the Academic Community............... 37
- D. Corrective Programs.................................... 38
  - 1. General Defense Intelligence Program: Third World Language and Area Studies Initiative....... 38
    - a. Defense Advanced Language and Area Studies Program (DALASP)........................... 40
    - b. Defense Academic Research Support Program (DARSP).................................... 41
    - c. Initial Program Results........................ 43
  - 2. OSD Sponsored Soviet and Eastern European Language and Area Studies Program................ 43
  - 3. NSA Programs.. 44
    - a. PL 97-89... 44
    - b. NSA Language Program........................... 45
    - c. NSA Cooperative Education Program............ 45
    - d. SPICE.. 46
    - e. ASTUTE... 49

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS................................ 49

TABLE OF CONTENTS (cont'd)

Page

Appendix A: Glossary.................................... 53

Appendix B: Bibliography................................ 55

Appendix C: DOD Intelligence Foreign Language Requirements and Capabilities...................... 57

Appendix D: Language Training and Cryptologic Linguistic Reserve Sections of Public Law 97-89.................................... 79

Appendix E: FLAS Inventory Surveys..................... 82

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SRI International wishes to acknowledge the invaluable guidance provided to this research project by two distinguished former defense intelligence officials: Admiral Bobby R. Inman, USN, (Ret.), and Lieutenant General Eugene F. Tighe, USAF, (Ret.).

In addition, this report would not have been possible without the major efforts and contributions of the following SRI International consultants: Thomas J. Hirschfeld, Stanley L. Falk, and Philip S. Cook.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Department of Defense (DOD) is the nation's primary consumer of foreign area research and foreign language expertise. It controls nearly 90 percent of Federal Government spending on information collection systems, and most systems designed to collect and anlayze information are developed, tasked, and operated by DOD personnel.

The sheer size and complexity of the DOD agencies make it difficult to comprehend -- let alone catalog -- the needs and requirements within these agencies for resource materials and skills in foreign language and area studies. DOD research and language skills are drawn from civilian research centers, university faculties, various Government agencies, internal and external translation support systems, and training programs both in the academic community and within the DOD agencies.

Are these resources adequate to satisfy our national needs? Opinions differ dramatically on the quality, timeliness, and utility of the foreign language and area expertise available to DOD agencies. A 1979 Rand Corporation study cited deficiencies in the government's employment and training systems and maintenance of expertise in exotic languages and areas, but found no general "market" shortage of area and language specialists. The Rand report, in particular, concluded that the case for more funding for language and area studies could not be argued on the basis of market demand.

On the other hand, the 1981 report of the Task Force on National Manpower Targets, a project sponsored by the National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, stated that the United States was losing the race with the Soviet Union for expert knowledge of foreign areas and that there are "realities so immediate that in certain critical areas -- Vietnam, Japan, Central America, and Southwest Asia -- it would be no exaggeration to speak of an endangered species of foreign area specialists."

Admiral B.R. Inman, former Deputy Director of the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and former head of the National Security Agency (NSA), recently stated the following to a congressional committee:

> My concern has grown as I have watched us become subject to surprise time and again, surprise where we have had insufficient assets applied to problems, and surprise because we did not understand the events that we had some inkling were underway. We have become very good at counting things, and very poor at projecting the challenges that we are likely to face.
>
> I believe increasingly that is a result of the lack of deep understanding of those societies, what motivates them, and how they are changing. The need for scholars inside the government is going to be much greater in the 15 years ahead of us than it has in the past 15 years. I believe we are moving into an increasingly hazardous time.

Any valid, current assessment of the research and education resource base in foreign language and area studies available to DOD agencies should begin with a statement of needs and requirements as defined by the users of such expertise: the policy makers, operational intelligence officers, planners, line managers, and so forth. To help determine whether the needs of the users of intelligence are, in fact, being met, and, if not, what changes in DOD practices and approaches are called for, SRI employed a combination of detailed questionnaires and in-depth interviews. Building on the assessments of the practitioners and users, the SRI project team sought to examine and assess the Defense Department's needs, existing resources, and actual uses of foreign language and area studies materials and expertise, with specific reference to intelligence analysis, foreign liaison, foreign military assistance, information gathering and operations.

SRI specifically avoided any attempt to assess the quality of the intelligence product or that of the data and analyses of which it was comprised. Instead, the SRI project team focused on the intelligence community as a major DOD user of foreign language and area expertise in an attempt to determine whether DOD has the capacity to produce or to obtain the expertise necessary to meet its responsibilities.

SRI sought to identify language/area training and skill maintenance needs not met by government institutions, and to suggest practical opportunities for the academic community to supplement them. It sought to ascertain whether differences between training, employment, and career patterns in Defense Intelligence institutions and in the Services suggest opportunities for language and area skill standardization within DOD, and perhaps some additional use of academic foreign language and area studies resources.

SRI reviewed the mechanisms presently used by DOD intelligence agencies to engage university faculty, training facilities, advanced graduate students, specialized academic researchers and others from the academic community in meeting their requirements for area and related discipline-based research and language expertise. Special attention was paid to the existing barriers between the defense intelligence community and the scholarly communities, and to potential ways of enhancing interaction among them, as well as more effective uses by DOD agencies of the national pool of scholars and academic experts.

In general terms, the SRI study found an awareness within DOD of the need to define and monitor more effectively the Department's current and future requirements for foreign area and language expertise. Indeed, efforts are already underway to establish government-wide language testing standards and to develop DOD-wide forecasts of foreign language and area requirements, as well as compatible inter-service personnel data bases.

The SRI study also confirmed that even as the intelligence field remains a stepchild in terms of military career opportunities and advancement, so language and area specialists appear to lag behind more general intelligence areas in terms of promotion, pay, and other opportunities. DOD intelligence entities should develop career patterns and a range of incentives to help attract and maintain highly qualified and motivated personnel with foreign language and area specialist skills.

The Department of Defense maintains an internal capacity to produce language specialists of high proficiency -- fairly quickly and in substantial numbers — and in many languages. Indeed, DOD language programs are able to outperform those in the academic community in terms of efficiency and cost effectiveness. But the Defense Department still has difficulty maintaining the language skills of personnel that it recruits and trains at considerable expense. DOD utilization of university language schools, both for initial training and for skill maintenance, would be enhanced if the universities were to develop uniform language testing standards that were compatible with those used by the U.S. Government.

Unlike language training, area specialist training is not centralized within the Department of Defense, except for a recently initiated experimental program, but rather is the responsibility of the individual services, the National Security Agency and the Defense Intelligence Agency. The Service programs for commissioned officers differ considerably in content, quality, and objective.

Area training for Navy and Air Force commissioned officers is provided in large measure by the Naval Post-Graduate School. Most Army Foreign Area Officers (FAOs) attend the Army's Foreign Area Officer course at Fort Bragg, N.C., and about half of these officers go on to graduate education at universities.

In addition to this direct involvement with academia, the Defense intelligence community makes periodic or occasional use of university faculty as teachers, consultants and contract researchers. The casual, ad hoc nature of this relationship can and should be improved. Current DOD arrangements for the procurement of external foreign language and area study resources should be reviewed. Both DOD and the academic community should consider new means of assisting universities in identifying and responding to DOD requirements.

The indirect support given the intelligence community by academic institutions and by individual scholars is of vital importance to analysts and area specialists. Books, journals, technical publications and monographs provide essential background for analysts preparing classified studies. While it is impossible to quantify this indirect support rendered by academia, or to link it in a meaningful way with specific intelligence tasks or endeavors, it became evident to the SRI project team that the Defense intelligence community values this assistance and expects that it will continue to be made available.

In plain terms, the SRI study found that despite warnings to the contrary the Defense intelligence community is not convinced that the resources provided both directly and indirectly by academia are a matter of great concern. This complacency does not arise from any residual resentment or animosity dating back to the turbulent 60's. At worst, Defense intelligence personnel regard the academic world as "out-of-sync" with the highly specialized needs of the Defense Department.

Overall, the intelligence community appears satisfied with the current state of its relations with the scholarly world. There is a confidence that, in terms of day to day requirements, the relationship is solidly based. Intelligence practitioners assume that however specialized or exotic are their needs for expertise and research, the academic community will always meet those needs; that the resources of academia are both universal and limitless.

Despite the concerns expressed by highly regarded experts over the apparent deterioration in the quantity and quality of foreign area and language specialists and the impact that this might have on the Defense Department's ability to protect U.S. national interests, the "users" of this expertise in the Defense intelligence community reflect no sense of alarm.

The SRI study project did not find within this somewhat narrow constituency any strong inclination to support increased investment in foreign language and area study programs within the academic community. For a variety of reasons, DOD intelligence officers do not share the alarm felt in academia and elsewhere. Thus, it would appear that, with the exception of some modest, expermental programs, the initiative for a greater expenditure of resources in foreign language and foreign area training and research must be found outside the largest governmental consumer of these specialized skills -- the Department of Defense.

Notwithstanding the conclusions stated above, the SRI project team feels obligated to underscore the strong correlation between the health and vigor of language and area study programs within the academic community and the quality of area and language specialists within the Defense intelligence community. The intelligence professionals interviewed by SRI were presumably all products of academic institutions with strong traditions of rigorous scholarship. In all likelihood they were beneficiaries to some extent of graduate programs that enjoyed unprecedented financial support in the post-Sputnik era -- programs that now find themselves less well endowed. Just as these professionals reflect the qualities and attributes of the institutions where they received their training and from whose scholarship and research efforts they continue to benefit, so will the intelligence professionals who follow them.

Any degradation of the language and area study programs that produce such unique talents and subsequently nourish and enrich the quality of their work will ultimately be felt in some perhaps immeasurable way in the capacity of the U.S. government to protect our national interests.

It is beyond the scope of this SRI study to speculate on the future capacity of academic institutions to meet the requirements of the Department of Defense for area studies and related foreign language expertise under any given set of circumstances. But it is not difficult to imagine a chain of events that would once again expose the United States as woefully ill-equipped in the human resources required to meet its international obligations. Driven by a wave of post-Sputnik national concern, in the late 1950s and 1960s the Federal Government and American foundations invested heavily in foreign area training and foreign language training. The results were impressive, but just as the fruits of these area studies investments were beginning to pay off, interest shifted to other concerns and funding dried up. The full penalty for this "boom and bust" support for intellectual and human assets that are easily lost may yet have to be paid.

There are indications that the problem extends beyond the defense intelligence community. While the SRI study made no attempt to examine language and area specialty competence among Defense Department personnel responsible for sensitive foreign assignments with military assistance groups and the like, there is a strong presumption that serious weaknesses exist. Unverified reports from senior Defense Department officials suggest that effective working relations with foreign counterpart personnel in allied and other friendly countries are hampered by inadequate language and area training for U.S. personnel assigned to a variety of important non-intelligence specialties.

II. METHODOLOGY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This report is submitted to the Association of American Universities (AAU) in fulfillment of SRI International contract No. 5884. This project has been conducted in response to Congressional guidance, and under the direction of the Office of the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, Department of the Army, and the DOD-University Forum Working Group on Foreign Language and Area Studies, as a subcontract to the AAU under Department of the Army Control DAMD17-83-C-3093.

The following report reviews the extent to which the DOD intelligence product benefits from university-based or other external foreign language and area research activities, as well as assesses DOD intelligence specialist perceptions of how these external resources might be made more readily available and useful to the Department.

This SRI inquiry has proceeded methodologically on two tracks: First, in excess of 35 face-to-face, in-depth open-ended interviews were conducted with intelligence managers from: the Department of Defense, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the National Security Agency, and the Department of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines. Scores of additional interviews were conducted by telephone. Second, where appropriate, these managers were asked to administer to their analysts an SRI-developed inventory assessing analyst background, training and use of external resources related to foreign language and area studies (FLAS). Copies of these questionnaire forms are appended to this report.

While the SRI project team had complete control over the first research track, we could not ensure complete and substantial response to the second. Therefore, our survey sample response to our second inquiry was less than the project team had sought. Nevertheless, the data made available by respondents to the second questionnaire is consistent with our findings from our in-depth interviews with DOD intelligence managers. Therefore, the project team has a high degree of confidence that this report's conclusions are an accurate reflection of current DOD utilization of external foreign language and area studies resources.

Also appended to this report (Appendix C) is the best available data collected by the Department of Defense regarding the Department's foreign language requirements, capabilities, and billet fill rates for FY1982-1984.

The SRI project team also conducted an extensive review of the literature available on this subject, of both a classified and unclassified nature. Appendix B enumerates some of the important published unclassified literature on this and related subjects.

This report makes clear that the DOD intelligence community's reliance on external FLAS resources varies significantly from one particular class of user to another, with all branches of the Armed Services and other Department intelligence specialists substantially more dependent upon indirect external resources (as defined in this study) versus direct utilization of such resources. However, specific programs have been initiated (particularly within the Defense Intelligence Agency and NSA) to actively solicit and utilize foreign language and area studies from academe and other private research institutions. Some initial results of the success of these programs are discussed in this report.

However, the SRI project team has identified a number of areas demanding the attention of both the Department and academe in order to facilitate and expand such areas of cooperation for mutual benefit as stated below.

1. Efforts underway within DOD to improve the definition of Department FLAS needs and requirements demand high level attention and support in order to be successful. An improved needs assessment will enhance identification of areas for collaboration with external FLAS resources.

2. The development of compatible DOD intelligence employee data bases will maximize intra-service/Department coordination of current FLAS in-house talent and rationalize the utilization of intelligence personnel.

3. Mechanisms must be further developed to provide for improved career progression for FLAS-trained personnel in order to help attract and maintain highly qualified and motivated intelligence officers.

4. Additional attention should be given to the development and aggressive implementation of a system of incentives in order to reward FLAS skill maintenance and improvements.

5. Current DOD practices for the procurement of external FLAS resources should be reviewed in order to improve the opportunities for the expedited identification and utilization of such resources.

6. Academe should consider the creation of an independent clearinghouse in order to assist universities in the identification of and response to DOD requests for FLAS assistance.

7. DOD should consider the development of a coordinated and regular bulletin to academe of job/skill intelligence opportunities in order to help enhance academic responsiveness to Department priorities and needs.

8. University language schools should be further encouraged to implement uniform, government-compatible language testing standards in order to improve DOD reliance upon campus language training programs.

9. Academe should seek to improve understanding and responsiveness to those specific DIA and NSA programs aimed at utilizing campus FLAS resources as possible prototypes for further Department/academic cooperation.

10. Academe should not expect major new DOD funding for campus-based FLAS programs. Rather, substantial new Federal bases of support for such programs are more likely to proceed with a broader government-wide level of support.

III. THE SYSTEM: FOREIGN LANGUAGE AND AREA SPECIALIZATION IN THE DOD INTELLIGENCE FIELD

There is among those concerned with the performance of the Defense intelligence community a marked -- if understandable -- difference in perspective on the nature and seriousness of the foreign language and area specialization issue. On the one side, there are the users and "overseers" of intelligence from policy-makers and senior managers of the intelligence system to congressional committees and "blue ribbon" commissions. On the other side, the day-to-day line managers of the Defense intelligence system who have the responsibility for recruiting, training, and utilizing analysts and linguists. The users and overseers of intelligence are centrally interested in the quality, usefulness, and timeliness of intelligence; the day-to-day managers, as this report notes, are mainly interested in the production of intelligence and the availability and technical competence of analysts and linguists. These differences in emphasis, while not incompatible, do provide striking differences in approach in defining and assessing what the needs of the system are and how the academic community can be of assistance.

As noted, the SRI team was not mandated to assess the "quality" of intelligence as produced by the Defense intelligence community, but rather to focus on the process of the production of intelligence and the training of analysts and language specialists. Nevertheless there was enough exposure to the policy-makers, the users of intelligence, and the overseers of foreign language and area specialists to afford a view of how they look at the problem -- and how their views contrast with that of the line managers.

In the view of the users and overseers, the condition of foreign language and area specialization within the Department of Defense resembles in many respects and reflects the generally declining state of language and language-related training and capabilities within the United States. In November 1979, the President's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies reported that it was "profoundly alarmed" by the "serious deterioration in this country's language and research capacity." This view was reinforced by the National Commission on Excellence in Education, which termed achievement of proficiency in foreign languages a matter for curriculum improvement that "must be addressed."

The impact of this weakness on the country's defense posture was emphasized in the 1981 congressional testimony of Admiral Bobby Inman. "The foreign language capability of our country is poor and getting worse," he stated bluntly. It constituted "a major hazard to our national security." The admiral then offered a graphic illustration:

> In our operations area, we are now losing many of our most experienced people who have had 20 or so years of service using a second and third language. Replacement of these people has been made difficult by the fact that many universities and colleges no longer have foreign language requirements as part of their mandatory curriculum . . . We need to be able to recruit and hire people who already possess capability in a foreign language and not lose the time required to train them in this skill after they are on board.[1]

His remarks were seconded by Major General Richard Larkin, then Deputy Director of the Defense Intelligence Agency:

> Recent trends show that intelligence opportunities based on language skills are increasing rapidly, while the availability of language-trained professionals has been gradually shrinking. This problem is directly related to the inability of our educational system to continue to provide the talent required for understanding foreign cultures and interpreting their behavior.[2]

---

[1] Foreign Language Assistance for National Security, Report of The Committee on Education and Labor (Report No. 98-162), House of Representatives, 96th Congress, 1st Session (1983).

[2] Ibid.

The problem became even more acute when seen in terms of specific needs for unusual or low density languages. Mirroring Admiral Inman's remarks, Mr. Craig Wilson, speaking for the Secretary of Defense at hearings in July 1981 before the House Postsecondary Education Subcommittee, pointed out that to support the proposed Rapid Deployment Force, an estimated additional 874 military linguist positions for six major Middle East and African languages and dialects would be needed. "For these, as well as almost all languages, there is not a trained, recruitable base within the American population." And as recently as March of this year, testifying before the same subcommmittee, Lieutenant General Eugene F. Tighe (USAF-Ret.), former director of the Defense Intelligence Agency, charged that "little understanding is shown by America of the hundreds of individual tribal languages and customs and traditions which drive Africa."

But even languages of a less esoteric nature can sometimes cause problems. General Tighe described an incident in which there was a near "total breakdown" of negotiations between the United States and a NATO ally over a major military contract. A shortage of Defense language specialists had led to the hiring of a commercial translating service, which "blundered horribly in . . . translating critically important documentation."

As suggested above, the availability of qualified language personnel for recruitment into the intelligence field has been of particular concern. Equally so has been the need for incentives for qualitative skills maintenance and improvement for such individuals already working for the Defense intelligence community. Even as the intelligence field has remained a stepchild in terms of military career opportunities and advancement, so too the language and area specialists have appeared to lag behind more general intelligence areas in terms of promotions, pay, and other opportunities. The lack of senior positions for language and area specialists mirrors the circumscribed opportunities for intelligence officers in general. The senior army intelligence officer, for example, the Assistant Chief of Staff for Intelligence, is only a major general and, before the present incumbent, no language/area specialist ever held that position. Similar constraints apply to the other services, to other desirable positions elsewhere in the hierarchy, and to the ranks of civilian specialists.

The National Security Agency, which manages the national cryptological program, has been experiencing difficulties recruiting, training, and retaining sufficient numbers of qualified linguists to meet both routine and crisis demands. In a 1981 review directed by the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, NSA reported that: (1) Not enough skilled linguists were being graduated from American educational institutions to meet government needs, especially in the intelligence community; (2) NSA and the military cryptologic elements faced a shortage of skilled, fully-trained linguists; (3) while government training institutions and authorities met NSA's basic and some advanced instructional needs, they did not provide for most of the advance requirements, such as rapid translation and transcription, that are unique to cryptologic linguist functions; and (4) NSA lacked the authority to engage and retain qualified language instructors on a long term basis.

The NSA review, and the strong concern of the Select Committee, prompted enactment of new legislation (Section 602 of PL 97-89, Dec. 4, 1981; see Appendix D) designed to alleviate this situation. This legislation, closely following NSA recommendations, authorized the Agency to provide monetary or other incentives to encourage civilian cryptologic personnel to acquire or retain proficiency in foreign languages. In addition to authorizing funds for tuition and training in nongovernment institutions (see Section III), the new law has enabled NSA to begin paying civilian linguists proficiency pay in return for demonstrated language skill maintenance. This is the first instance of specific monetary incentives for linguists within the DOD intelligence community. The Army staff continues to propose proficiency pay for qualified language officers and enlisted men, but as yet no authority exists for such a program. Nor is there any indication that the other services share the Army's view.

The non-cryptological agencies of the Defense intelligence establishment, that is, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Services, and the Unified and Specified Commands, have set up committees to assure that language and area requirements are identified more efficiently and that sufficient training is provided to sustain the necessary skills. These currently active bodies include the General Officer's Steering Committee, the Inter-Agency Foreign Language Round Table, and the Foreign Language Training Committee. They represent new efforts to identify, codify, and improve the trained resource base.

These expressions of concern over the state of foreign language and area specialization in the DOD intelligence field -- and some action as a result of such high-level concerns -- should be assessed against the background of how the system actually works. And the place to begin is how the DOD deals with the issue of language training and utilization.

A. Language

There are thousands of jobs in DOD that require some language skills. Not all are specifically identified as language positions, so counting them is impossible. Most but not all of these are intelli-gence jobs filled by civilians and by military personnel from the Services themselves, in the Defense Intelligence Agency, and in the National Security Agency. The need for language skills for actual job performance is far greater than the need for area expertise. Thus in most cases area expertise is a subordinate skill useful to enhance the performance of a language related job, although there are a few hundred analytical positions where English materials overwhelmingly predominate and area skills are primary. Therefore the larger DOD training and maintenance effort has historically been in the language area.

1. Language Use

Within the entire Defense intelligence community -- the National Security Agency, the Services, and the Defense Intelligence Agency -- language has a large variety of uses. Before enumerating what these are, it is important to note that the Services supply the uniformed personnel whom NSA and DIA employ, albeit temporarily, and that the services retain control of these people's careers.

Intelligence tasks that require language capability include communications and signal collection, monitoring and interpretation, decryption and code breaking, intelligence liaison, and jobs involving direct human contact like prisoner interrogation. Language skills required to perform the jobs under these functional headings vary enormously. NSA, with its mission of communications and signal intelligence, collection, decryption, and code breaking, is perhaps the largest trainer and user of language talent. Most of NSA's language requirements involve passive language skills. That is, they involve those functions where one needs to be able to read, understand and record in writing, if necessary, what one hears.

Because NSA trains its own civilian professionals -- some 70 percent of its personnel are civilians -- and retrains many of its military personnel, NSA has a large requirement for language teachers. Military personnel at NSA, overwhelmingly enlisted personnel who carry out signals intelligence work, are normally trained initially at the Defense Language Institute (DLI). These individuals, like the civilian personnel, are then qualified according to NSA's standards. Ninety percent of the military brought into NSA require additional training according to NSA's standard test, the Standard Proficiency Entry Level test (SPEL-2), which emphasizes listening and understanding skills and has become the standard throughout the cryptological community. Level 3 (adequate for professional use) is the hope but not the expectation of NSA training. It is on highly qualified linguists that the NSA as an agency depends for achievement of its complex tasks.

The analytical function is also very important. This is the business of reviewing the intelligence product collected from a wide variety of sources and in a large number of languages, comparing the reports and making judgments as to their truth or falsehood, evaluating their relative significance, and then apprising interested authorities of the results. The analytical function also includes making estimates based on information or predicting what is likely to happen based on an understanding of past practice. For this function, language skills are less important than area knowledge. Indeed, the job of producing finished intelligence reports is done in English; for example, the briefings of the end results or the writings of the end results for policymakers' use are never done in any other language and are normally by people who use materials in English only. So, depending, upon the language and area, intelligence analysis requires everything from very good reading skills in very esoteric languages to none at all.

Intelligence liaison, that is, the diplomatic work of attaches and the business of maintaining connections with intelligence services of friendly countries also requires some language skills, or none, depending upon the nature and origin of the foreign interlocutor. These, however, tend to be spoken skills more often than not. Since both social and professional vocabularies are required, spoken skills of a very high order are useful, if not requisite, in non-English speaking countries. For prisoner interrogation, virtually native competence in the spoken language is a requirement in order to persuade the unwilling enemy prisoner to reveal what he knows. Reading and writing skills are of lesser importance.

Finally, all four functions, reading, understanding, speaking, and writing, are normally necessary for someone who wishes to become anything more than an entry-level or assistant language instructor within the DOD training system.

2. Language Training

The largest and most important -- indeed, the central -- agency for language training within the Department of Defense is the Defense Language Institute (DLI), at the Presidio of Monterey, California. A DOD-level organization, DLI serves all four of the armed services (i.e., including USMC), as well as a few other executive branch agencies. DLI's primary mission is to conduct a full-time resident foreign language training program, and to develop and offer non-resident language programs for DOD personnel.

Since its establishment some forty years ago -- originally as an Army language school -- DLI has graduated over 120,000 students from its various resident military language programs. At present, it is training approximately 5,000 students a year, of which a little more than half are Army personnel; about a quarter of the students are from the Air Force, with considerably smaller contingents from the Navy and Marine Corps, and a few score DOD and other civilians. Of those in uniform, the overwhelming majority are enlisted personnel, abour 80-85% on average. While most of the training takes place at Monterey, shortage of billeting space has necessitated the establishment of small training branches at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas (Russian language) and the Presidio of San Francisco (German, Korean, and Spanish). None of the services has anything comparable, although the US Army Russian Institute at Garmisch, Germany, a two-year study program, does include considerable language training.

The Defense Language Institute can teach 39 of the 57 languages and dialects for which DOD has stated a requirement (see chart). The other 18, primarily low demand or low density languages, such as Afrikaans or Urdu, can be taught at the Foreign Service Institute in Washington, D.C., or contracted out to civilian institutions. The latter process is handled by the DLI Liaision Office in Washington, "riding" a USAID or USIA contract with one of several local commercial language schools. Contracts with local universities are not practical, either because the required languages are too esoteric to be included in a university curriculum or because the courses offered are not sufficiently intensive to meet DLI needs. On average, some 66 full or part-time students are carried annually under these contracts with commercial language schools.

The 39 languages and dialects taught at DLI are divided into three major language groups: Asian/Middle East, Romantic/German, and Slavic. The top ten in terms of students scheduled to attend in FY 1984 are Russian, German, Spanish, Korean, Arabic, Polish, Chinese, Czech, French, and Turkish. Some of the most significant shifts since FY 1982 include a 25 percent decrease in the number of students studying Russian, a 26 percent increase in those studying Arabic, and a 19 percent increase for Korean. Chinese remains in the top ten, although Chinese requirements have dropped by 53 percent since FY 1982. Turkish is new on the list, replacing

Italian. The exact number of students studying a given language depends on the annual requirements established by the military services and other agencies such as the State Department or FBI.

DLI has nearly 700 language instructors, all of whom are proficient in their languages and have first-hand knowledge of the culture, customs, religions, and history of the country or area where the language they teach is spoken. Nearly all -- 98 percent -- are native speakers. Seventy-five of the instructors have Ph.Ds, 320 have MA's, and about half of the others have BAs. Of those without BAs, 50 have AAs. A few advanced degrees are in linguistics; many are in education or other fields.

DLI LANGUAGE CAPABILITIES

- Afghan
  - Dari
  - Pashto

- Arabic
  - Modern Standard
  - Egyptian
  - Syrian
  - Iraqi

- Albanian
- Blugarian
- Chinese
  - Mandarin
  - Cantonese

- Czech
- Dutch
- French
- German
- Greek
- Haitian
  - Creole
- Hungarian
- Indonesian
- Italian
- Japanese

- Korean
- Norwegian
- Persian
  - Dari
  - Farsi

- Polish
- Portuguese
  - Brazilian
  - European

- Romanian
- Russian
- Serbo
  - Croatian
- Slovene
- Spanish
  - Latin American
  - Castilian

- Swedish
- Tagalog
- Thai
- Turkish
- Vietnamese
  - Hanoi
  - Saigon

Military members of the staff and faculty come from all four services, but until recently the teaching staff was entirely civilian. A current change has seen the integration of enlisted military instructors into the faculty, to supplement the regular curriculum by emphasizing military affairs and specific military terminology. These military instructors will not replace the civilian teachers, but will play a role similar to that of teaching assistants in civilian colleges. The Intergovernmental Personnel Act offers one means of temporarily integrating faculty from academe -- there are now two or three such individuals teaching at Monterey, and DLI would like to add more — but this procedure has only limited appeal to college administrators. For one thing, there is no financial compensation to the university that is losing a faculty member for a year, other than the fact that during this period the government will be paying the faculty member's salary. For another, the university is then faced with the problem of replacing its absent faculty member, with no guarantee that it can obtain an equivalent replacement. The individual faculty member, in turn, must accept the extremely high cost of living in California, for which he is not recompensed.

DLI aims at producing solid Level 2 language proficiency (by Department of State, Foreign Service Institute standards),[3] which DLI considers the equivalent of six years of college language training. In practice, however, the Level 2 goal has only been met to a limited degree: in Spanish, for example. Very few students become fluent; graduates who do develop such proficiency achieve it only after an assignment in or near the area where their language is spoken.

---

[3] FSI Level 2 constitutes "limited working proficiency;" it differs from NSA's Standard Proficiency Entry Level test (SPEL-2).

DLI seeks to develop proficiency in the four separate language skills of reading, writing, speaking, and comprehension. To this end, students attend classes five days a week for six hours each day, with an additional three hours of nightly homework. The average class size is seven, with the number of students in each class ranging from a single individual to ten (the maximum allowed). Most of the basic language courses run from 24 to 47 weeks in length: the longest courses for a language like Russian, the shortest for Spanish or Italian. DLI does not teach area studies per se, but as an adjunct to language training there is an effort to provide an introduction to foreign culture: customs and habits, philosophy and way of life, demographics, geography, and so forth.

In addition to their classroom work, students can use the DLI Learning Resource Center, which offers a wide variety of current foreign language programs on video cassettes. The DLI library also has an impressive selection of foreign-language books and periodicals.

DLI also supports an extensive, world-wide non-resident program to provide graduates with continued access to foreign language maintenance and refresher materials. The Institute also offers a large number of non-resident courses and materials that can be purchased by both DOD and non-DOD personnel for use in unit language programs or for individual study.

DLI graduates normally go on to duty assignments in one of seven different functional areas. The largest groups, slightly more than half, go into the cryptologic training system for duty with the various security services. The next largest group serves with Army line units, or perform a variety of military intelligence "HUMINT" functions, like prisoner interrogation. Smaller numbers join the various Military Assistance Advisory Groups or enter the Defense Attache system. Others go on to other service schools, miscellaneous assignments such as the Army Special Forces, or return to their civilian agencies.

DLI language level standards have in the past differed from those used by the State Department Foreign Service Institute. As a result of efforts by the Interagency Language Roundtable to establish government-wide standards, DLI has been attempting to adopt the FSI standards and has created new tests to meet their requirements. Present regulations do require retesting of DLI graduates, but this will not be carried out until after the new tests have been fully developed. These will include a new speaking proficiency test in addition to the present foreign language listening and reading proficiency tests.

University officials visiting DLI have been impressed with the idea of uniform performance standards for language testing, since the lack of standard proficiency tests in colleges and universities precludes measurement of the quality of foreign language training in academia. The American Council of Teaching of Foreign Language/ETS is looking into the possibility of modifying DOD language testing standards for use by the academic community.

3. Language Coding, Maintenance and Availability

The recording of language skills is not a uniform process throughout the Department of Defense, within the intelligence community, or even among the Services and DIA. However, the Defense Manpower Data System, in Monterey, a component which reports to the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Manpower and Reserve Affairs), in the summer of 1983 began coding language skills for the Services into mutually compatible form. At present, Service data bases are largely compatible, in that they contain compatible data elements for reflecting language skill levels. Yet a great deal more harmonization seems necessary, before one could get, for example, a complete, all-Service inventory of Spanish speaking O-4s Majors/Lieutenant Commanders with communications experience. Furthermore, the current skills level data is often useless because service data bases lack information on when the individual was tested.[*]

A typical (Air Force) method of coding language skills for 244 languages and storing them in the computer according to a uniform letter code follows:

A. No knowledge
B. No practical knowledge
C. Extremely limited knowledge
D. Very limited knowledge
E. Limited knowledge
F. Routine knowledge
G. Proficient
H. Very proficient
I. Extremely proficient
J. Equivalent to native
K. Equivalent to well-educated native
L. Occupying a language position
M. Refuse to test
N. Unknown

The computer accepts only one symbol next to each name. Thus, the phrase, "Occupying a language position," which presumarly requires '3' level skills, would preempt all the other indicators. An officer who had a higher than level '3', therefore, would not necessarily have that fact reflected, according to this method of skill coding. Civilian personnel will not be included in the Defense Manpower Data System's data base for the Services, reportedly for security reasons. As is the case, the Services, and individual agencies like NSA and DIA, will maintain their own data bases for civilians. NSA reportedly has a reliable and detailed language inventory for civilian employees. DIA is making efforts to obtain one, which is not yet complete. Within DIA's career development personnel records (Intelligence Career Development Program - ICDP), language skills are recorded and kept current in a data base called the Defense Intelligence Civilian Access System (DISCAS). The system is deficient in that it records self appraised language skill levels (for up to five languages), which are often inaccurate reflections of real capabilities. DIA has no testing program. Furthermore, DIA has never identified its language-related civilian positions. There are two bureaucratic reasons for this: concern that the Office of Personnel Management (formerly the Civil Service Commission) might arbitrarily downgrade the position once it has become a language slot, and reluctance to ascribe an arbitrary quality (in this case language level 3) to a particular position, lest that position then remain empty because of the difficulty of finding someone fully qualified to fill it. The latter reason also has led service and unified Commands to avoid identifying further needs for language and area specialists. This becomes a vicious circle. Commands will not identify a need unless trained people are available and the Services in turn cannot train uniformed personnel, nor can the civilian agencies hire or train civilians, until such a need is identified.

---

[*] Area expertise is not coded, in combination with language or in any uniform way among the services, except in the sense that the Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps can retrieve names of their qualified, designated Foreign Area Specialists (the Navy does not track area specialists as such), along with indications of their area training and exposure. Also, because academic training level and major area of study are usually identified, along with language, it is possible to make educated guesses about which personnel records are the most promising for further review in the assignment process.

Several committees within the Defense Intelligence community are addressing this cluster of problems in the hope of achieving some uniform data base which in turn will allow a more rational assignment pattern. Such a data base and the resultant possibilities for rapid and efficient cross service assignments do not now exist for language or area trained personnel. In fact, if a Defense authority at the policy level had a sudden need for a uniformed person or civilian with a particular set of language and area skills, his most likely course of action would be to call Service personnel systems directly in the hope that they might be able to come up with someone rapidly. These in turn seem as likely to rely on corridor reputations, old-boy nets, and other qualitative clues based on some list of names which a computer has provided but which contains too little current information to be of immediate use.

Skill maintenance is another very important consideration. Many offices hire civilians or military who begin with competent or marginally competent language skills, but who gradually move to supervisory positions or to positions covering geographic areas where their original language skills erode. There is at the present time no uniform method to keep these resources from rusting away.

Maintenance of the language skills of military officers taking academic training in some geographic or functional area is not done well in academe. Military interviewees claim that university programs produce language proficiency too slowly, an inadequacy that applies to language skill maintenance no less than to basic language training. The key factor for the sending service or agency is time; the need is for short, highly intensive training courses.

Of these interviewed, almost all analysts or intelligence supervisors overseeing jobs that use language-qualified personnel in language-related if not always language-designated positions, say better language competence would improve performance. This allegation usually reflects concern that some important written or spoken statement may occasionally slip by for not having been clearly understood.

Long-range identification of needed additional language competence is difficult. It depends on currently perceived scarcities and future projections of requirements. These in turn usually reflect policies and strategic circumstances in existence at the time the language training choices are made. Since these essentially political circumstances change from year to year, projected language needs must also be reviewed annually lest these projections not reflect the actual requirements of the intelligence community at the time trainees emerge from the pipeline. Thus, current projections about what language skill DOD or its intelligence components will need in the future are inherently unreliable. Because this data base for calculating current needs is inadequate, future projected requirements are unlikely to remain valid. Tentative current DOD wide language needs projections and current capabilities are provided in Appendix C. They tend to focus on Russian, other European languages, Arabic, Korean, and Chinese. However, analysts' guesses about what will remain useful include French and Portugese, Chinese, Russian, the languages of Soviet Central Asia, and other Eastern European tongues, Japanese, Swahili, West African languages, Amharic, Somali, Arabic, and especially dialect Arabic.

Language training requirements may also differ according to geographical area. For West Africa, for example, the real intelligence language needs may well be at the collection end, rather than among the analysis. This is because of the character of reporting requirements for Africa, a continent that seems increasingly sensitive to tribal considerations. Many African military establishments tend to be stratified by tribe, with NCO's and junior officers belonging to one group and senior officers to another. Also, most military coups in Africa have been tribally based. Thus, for one of the major purposes of Defense intelligence, which is assessing the continued stability of governments, it would be important to have access to the different, usually tribal-based levels of military establishments. This requirement makes it useful to assign to attache officers, junior personnel who, if not properly language qualified, can rapidly become so. Since it seems improbable that one can train large numbers of people in the myriad esoteric and often unwritten tribal languages spoken by relatively small populations, the solution at least for attache personnel and perhaps for some of NSA collectors lies in good threshold-level phonetical training. For example one could train in some branch of the Bantu family of languages where, upon perception of the need, the trainee could rapidly branch off into some related tongue through immersion. A more orthodox view is that one can and should identify those languages that one needs and train people for them.

Perhaps the most difficult skill maintenance problem concerns the "surge" contingency, i.e., the emergence of a situation like the Vietnam War when a particular group of esoteric languages was suddenly in very short supply. Indeed, the inherent instability of third world nations has presented the intelligence community with a series of crisis situations which could not be supported by existing linguistic resources. Clearly none of the services or other defense institutions can permanently retain all the qualified personnel whom they might need against all conceivable contingencies. The obvious solution is an available talent pool of personnel external to the intelligence establishment but readily available upon call.

As one might expect, the reserve program is the first repository of such talent. Some uniformed services have elaborate programs for maintaining the skills of those of their reserve personnel who are actually assigned to particular wartime positions in an emergency. Thus there are funds or other incentives such as reserve retirement points available for the Bahassa-speaking officer who holds a wartime assignment as assistant attache in Indonesia. Because such reservists are spread throughout the country, the language maintenance they undertake to remain proficient within their speciality can often be obtained locally at universities and other such institutions.

However, some language maintenance is provided through reserve training. The Air Force, for example, has some 90 officers who are language and area specialists and who have been assigned wartime billets where their talents are presumed to be of particular use. Many of these are prisoner interrogators who require spoken language skills of high order. These men are trained one weekend a month in a special program at 60 Air Force sites around the United States and have an additional opportunity for further training two weeks every other year at the Defense Language Institute in California. The intensive weekend training, which consists mainly of interaction between native or near native speakers through meetings in a structured environment including films and writing, is considered by the Air Force a more effective means of language maintenance for this select group than academic training or lessons. There are an additional 190 Air Force Reservists not assigned to wartime billets, who are language and area specialists. These receive minimal support for language maintenance.

The Army program is much less ambitious. Language and area specialists are usually assigned to reserve civil affairs or intelligence units. These individuals are normally well qualified native linguists, or those who use the language in their personal or professional life, or those with advanced degrees who teach or work in a Foreign Area Officer (FAO)-related discipline. Training varies. Individual reservists can take an FAO correspondence course or use tapes and other individual study packages prepared by DLI. A few attend brief courses at DLI. Some units conduct their own training. Overall, language maintenance training seems to be an individual or unit affair, with little overall direction or program guidance.

Naval reserve linguists -- other than cryptologists, who apparently constitute the bulk of them, but whose organization and maintenance program cannot be discussed here — fall into two groups: a Foreign Language Translator Reserve Component, which has a language maintenance training program as an integral part of its normal duties, and a reserve unit for attaches, which has no formal maintenance program. The former consists of some 40 officers who undertake translation work assigned to them on a regular basis by the Navy. They also use DLI to maintain oral skills and every two or three years conduct a two-week training workshop.

B. Area Training

Unlike language training, area training is not centralized at the DOD level, except for a recently initiated experimental program, but rather is the responsibility of the individual Services, NSA, and DIA. The Service programs for commissioned officers differ considerably in content, quality, and objective, for several reasons. First of all, there is a lack of common definition of geographic regions or areas, without which there can be no DOD-wide definition of area specialists or training programs. Although efforts are under way to try to achieve agreement, the problem is as yet unresolved. Furthermore, the services have different needs for area specialists, varying not only in quantity and degree of specialization, but also in the level and intensity of training.

- The Army has the greatest need for area specialists for assignments to intelligence, plans and operations, security assistance, psychological warfare, civil affairs, and unconventional warfare positions.

These duties justify a separate secondary speciality, Foreign Area Officer (FAO), in which an individual can spend some 12 years of a 30 year career. Air Force officers, however, are less likely to be involved to such a degree in assignments requiring an area specialty. While they may serve as attaches, political-military specialists, and in other positions requiring area knowledge, these requirements are secondary to other considerations. Specifically, a large proportion of these posts must be filled by rated officers (pilots or navigators) who are required to return periodically to flying units. The Air Force thus tends to prefer their officers to be functional experts primarily, with area knowledge and capabilities as clearly secondary. Tha Navy, with its focus on service in the fleet and operations at sea rather then on activities ashore that would require elaborate area and language capabilities, is even less interested in area specialists. Naval intelligence is primarily concerned with enemy naval forces, rather than civil administration or other requirements ashore. Hence, the Navy can concentrate on a few languages and areas and does not feel it requires a formal area expert subspecialty as elaborate as that of the Army. Navy area experts carry an individual designator as Country Area/Regional Specialists, and can have a subspecialty in politico-military affairs or intelligence. There is, however, some concern in naval intelligence circles over lack of depth in such obvious areas of interest as the Soviet Union and Latin America. In contrast, the Marine Corps, with longer overseas shore duty, does feel a need for a limited number of area specialists and has developed a small program.

In light of the foregoing, it is not surprising that the Army has the most elaborate area training program, and that it is universally recognized as such within the intelligence community. Army area speciality training involves several related phases, conducted under various auspices. Officers receive basic language training at the Defense Language Institute and six months of specialized area training at the Army's Foreign Area Officer Course at Fort Bragg, N.C. They may also attend high level courses at foreign military staff colleges. Selected officers, perhaps half of the army's area specialists, will be sent to obtain a graduate level degree in a foreign area-related academic discipline. Perhaps as many as 50 or 60 of these are attending fully-funded graduate programs at as many as 40 colleges or universities of their choice that have acceptable area study graduate programs; the specific colleges will vary from year to year and student to student. Another 40 students may be enrolled in a cooperative degree program at Campbell University, N.C., linked to their course work at the FAO course at Ft. Bragg, and another 20-25 in a similar program with Georgetown University tied in with their assignment to the U.S. Army Russian Institute at Garmisch, Germany. Still another three dozen officers, who will be teaching at the U.S. Military Academy in related disciplines, are attending graduate schools under a joint USMA-FAO program.

An elaborate overseas training program usually consists of a year's travel and research in the region of specialization. Some officers may spend two years at the U.S. Army Russian Institute in Garmisch, involving advanced academic study, language training, and travel to Eastern Europe. Others will spend a like period at the British Ministry of Defense Chinese Language School in Hong Kong. Whether or not an officer participates in all phases of this training program will depend on his individual background and experience, but the end result is an ambitious and effective course of development.

Compared to the Army area specialty training program, that of the Air Force is far less extensive. Air Force personnel selected for such training, if they do not already possess proficiency in the language of the area to be studied, will undergo language training at DLI or, in a few cases, FSI. The overwhelming majority of these officers will then attend appropriate courses at the Naval Post-Graduate School, Monterey, CA. Some officers will be sent under an AFIT-sponsored program for graduate study at the MA level in Latin American affairs at the University of Texas, Alabama, or Tulane. This year, for the first time, the Air Force is funding a single doctoral candidate, in Southern European affairs, and plans to place two more next year, in Soviet and East European studies. The Air Force also sends one or two officers annually to selected universities for a year of post-BA area training under its "Research Associate" program. Nevertheless, the Air Force definitely prefers to send its selectees to an in-service institution like the Naval Post-Graduate School where it has influence over the curriculum content and where classified material can be employed. Furthermore, there is no guarantee that Air Force selectees for outside graduate study will be admitted by the desired college or university.

Area studies in the Navy are confined to the Post-Graduate School at Monterey, with language training essentially at the DLI. Naval officers spend either a year or 18 months in the National Security Affairs Program at the Post-Graduate School, where area studies constitute an important portion of the curriculum. Completion of this program -- or possession of an equivalent academic degree — entitles an officer to the Country Area/Regional Specialist designator. A handful of officers have attended the Army's area program, but there is no Navy program to send area trainees to civilian academic institutions.

The Marine Corps has a small area training program for four officers annually, one each to be trained in Russian, Spanish, Chinese, and Arabic. Following language training at DLI, these officers go abroad for a year's advanced study at the Army Russian Institute at Garmisch, the U.S. Army School of the Americas in Panama, the Singapore National University, or a State Department FSI facility in Tunis. They are also encouraged and generously funded to travel and develop personal relationships. The Marine Corps has no area study advanced degree program at civilian academic institutions in the United States.

The Defense Intelligence Agency, which uses a great number of military and civilian area/language specialists, does not have its own area training program. Military and civilian analysts assigned to or hired by DIA are assumed to have the requisite skills for their jobs. DIA, however, does provide considerable support in the area of skill maintenance. An analyst orientation program sends analysts abroad on orientation trips to their area of specialty; there is also some funding for language refresher courses and attendance at relevant professional conferences. On a selective basis, funds are available for analysts to attend a civilian graduate school for a year — some have attended George Washington University in Washington, D.C. — and individuals are also encouraged to pursue outside studies on their own. In general, however, there has been a clearly perceived need for a greater and more formal program of continued area training: overseas, in civilian institutions, or in DOD programs. For this reason, an experimental program was initiated in 1982. (See Section IV).

For NSA, the word "area" has a functional as well as a geographical meaning. Economics or engineering are "areas" within the NSA terminology, just as Southwest Asia or West Africa are. Thus, NSA can identify needs for such personnel as a computer-capable Chinese language officer, for example, with the computer skills as the functional area. In a more traditional sense, the NSA analysts world is not very different from the world of the freelance translator. He should know the total environment in which his language is used; he needs to know both history and culture in order to understand the words that he hears. Thus, while language is easily the primary qualification, area expertise is what makes that language meaningful. It helps the analysts to understand the environment in which the language is used by imparting some sophistication about the context of the modern idiom, e.g., the tennis vocabulary used in ordinary conversation, such as "the ball is in his court," is necessary in order to understand that phrase in another context.

Because of this unique definition of "area," NSA training programs, many of which bear acronyms like ASTUTE, meaning "Area Studies to Understand Today's Events," include training in such non-geographic matters as arms control. Nevertheless, there are clearly potential opportunities for NSA training of the classical variety in the academic world (see Section III).

C. Area Specialist Utilization

While most officers with area training spend much of their time on various intelligence tasks such as attache service or analytical work, all area specialists are not in the intelligence field. It is for this reason that Army, Air Force, and Marine Corps officer area specialists are not classified as intelligence officers, as such. Area specialists perform such non-intelligence duties as filling positions in military assistance advisory groups overseas, in policy organizations such as Geographic Directorates in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, or in military or Defense related positions on U.S. negotiating delegations, such as arms control, the Panama Canal, or Okinawa or Pacific Islands reversion delegations; they may also perform liaison work with foreign armed forces at various international headquarters or even with foreign ministries of defense. While language requirements in such positions vary from intensive and detailed understanding of the spoken and written language to none at all, most of these tasks require area expertise of some kind, particularly understanding of the social and political environments in which the armed forces of the country of assignment are raised.

IV. ACADEMIC RELATIONS

For purposes of this report, relations between the Defense intelligence community and the academic world have been organized into analyses of direct relationships, areas of indirect support, Defense intelligence attitudes towards academia and vice versa, and programs that reflect the Defense intelligence community's growing interest in better relations with and support from academia. The latter section is headed "Corrective Programs" because the programs described therein attempt to bridge the gap between the largely self-contained Defense intelligence world and the academic community outside. It is worth noting that some of these corrective programs are experimental: in contrast to several NSA programs, now established by law and well underway, a number of new initiatives represent attempts by the non-cryptologic intelligence agencies to reach out and establish better relations with the academic world.

In this discussion of relations with academia, all of the comments of those interviewed in the course of this study must be understood in the context of the assumption that the academic resources upon which DOD intelligence agencies have relied would continue to be available to them. The academic world is expected to continue producing the monographic literature, scholarly syntheses, and quality educational processes that will somehow create or develop the capabilities and qualifications of future candidates for DOD employment or assignment -- not to mention a continuous stream of expert consultants and lecturers for Defense educational facilities. Because the permanent availability of this productive academic world is assumed, specific relations with academe tend to focus on programs to make available particular kinds of talent or training now in short supply or, on occasion, those studies that cannot be produced as readily, or at all, within the Defense establishment itself.

A. Direct Relations

In addition to formal programs outlined below, the Defense intelligence community makes periodic or occasional use of university faculty as teachers or consultants. Academic scholars appear on the platform of Defense intelligence educational facilities, or in their classrooms or seminars. Furthermore, analysts and intelligence officers interviewed report a variety of sporadic informal arrangements with academic personnel who may be located near the contracting Service or Defense intelligence institution. For example, various naval intelligence facilities in the Norfolk area employ professors from local universities, mainly naval reservists with claimed specialities in the Soviet area and some understanding of the Soviet navy. In another case, a not uncommon occurrence, a senior intelligence officer met periodically with his former professor, a recognized authority on Chinese affairs. Such informal arrangements seem normal and suggest a diffuse but pervasive pattern of "old boy" nets based on personal relations, rather than any DOD-, Service-, or Command-wide selection systems.

There was no evidence that intelligence analysts with area knowledge requirements made much use of local university libraries or other facilities unless they themselves were taking courses in some degree program at these institutions. Indeed for most analysts, academic connections gained during their own educational experience seemed to erode with time. It should be noted, however, that some respondents, not in close proximity to major academic institutions, expressed a need for better access to a good university library.

Finally, Defense agencies contract for a number of outside studies each year, mostly of a military or technical nature, but also including some social science research. Without dwelling on the formal procurement process, it seems appropriate to assume that the same informal informational "old boy" network also applies to some degree in soliciting and identifying contractor candidates. (For a sample of academic product use, see the discussion of DTIC below).

B. Indirect Support

Within the broad area of indirect support of the intelligence community provided by academic/scholarly institutions and individuals, one of the most obvious sources is the continuing publication of books, journals, and special studies and monographs in the general category of area studies. These publications -- historical, sociological, cultural, political, geographic, and so forth -- serve as the broad basis and background for analysts preparing more specific, classified studies. While the tendency is for analysts to focus on current, more general periodicals -- such as Foreign Affairs or Far East Economic Review -- or on technical publications, they do read some university-based periodicals, and scholarly books and journals are used for deeper research where time and analytical requirements permit or demand them.

DOD area specialists are first exposed to the world of scholarly publications as part of their own formal education (whatever form this may take). This exposure is further reinforced by their personal ties with former teachers and civilian classmates (many of whom have gone on into the academic field themselves), by occasional attendance at scholarly meetings, and by references in the better, more popular periodical literature. Thus familiar with such publications, intelligence specialists will continue to make limited use of them for general background and familiarization, or perhaps to provide specific background for a particular piece of classified analysis based more extensively on current classified intelligence data.

While the nature of the procurement process in DOD classified and unclassified libraries and research collections renders it impossible to quantify such indirect support, or to link library resources meaningfully with specific intelligence tasks or endeavors, it is evident that many DOD area specialists are aware of the value of scholarly publications, that they are familiar with publications in their field, and that, in varying degrees, they find them useful as general or specific background sources. In many instances, of course, such materials have only limited application to current intelligence requirements, or time constraints preclude their extensive utilization. By the same token, many area specilists are restricted in their reading of such materials to spare moments, or off-duty hours, because of their heavy workload of current materials. But there seems to be a consensus among specialists interviewed that there will be a continuing need for high-quality scholarly publications of this sort, that in an ideal world specialists would have time to make greater use of such publications, and that extensive foreign area study programs and publications provide a sound basis for the development of area specialists and for their indirect support in DOD.

Intelligence community use of written academic products is not, of course, limited to published material. Many studies, specifically contracted for by DOD with universities or other nongovernmental sources, are available within the Department and may be utilized by groups other than the contracting agency. Copies of these unclassified studies are available in the Defense Technical Information Center (DTIC), a centralized data base for scientific and technical information. Included among DTIC's many subject fields and areas are a number of topics in the behavioral and social sciences with material pertaining to the foreign intelligence field. Many of the studies and reports included in this collection were, as indicated, prepared by universities or other scholarly institutions working under contract. While the organization of the data does not allow ready extraction of statistical material specifically pertinent to the present analysis, it is possible to obtain some useful indications. A sample of 100 studies prepared by ten academic institutions -- Columbia, Cornell, and Stanford Universities, MIT, and the Universities of Alabama, California (Berkeley), California (L.A.), Chicago, Pennsylvania, and Texas -- gives some indication of usage by Defense and Service agencies over the past two years. The DTIC-defined fields covered by these studies, and selected by the SRI study team for this survey, are: economics; history, law, and political science; human factors engineering; humanities; linguistics; psychology; and sociology.

While there seeems to be a general lack of awareness among individual analysts and intelligence supervisors interviewed of what DTIC has to offer in these fields, the studies are widely used in DOD and the Services, in large measure because of DTIC's initiatives in publicizing its holdings. DTIC has two ways of identifying and responding to its client agencies. The first is by a regular distribution of indexes and finding aids, including a bi-weekly abstract bulletin, from which users can order documents. The second is by means of a user profile maintained by DTIC, based on stated needs and areas of interest of Service and DOD agencies; this profile is run against DTIC holdings every two weeks and document distribution made automatically as a result.

Of the 100 studies considered for this sample, a total of 1,613 copies have been distributed over the past two years (i.e., some documents were distributed in multiple copies, perhaps to several users, some not at all). The breakdown is as follows:

	Automatic Distribution	Specific Request	Total
ARMY (42 agencies)	543	67	610
NAVY (31 agencies)	494	45	539
AIR FORCE (40 agencies)	284	73	357
OTHER DOD COMPONENTS (14)	76	31	107
	1,397	216	1,613

The same figures, arranged by university providing the study, are as follows:

DISTRIBUTION OF UNIVERSITY-GENERATED STUDIES

	No. of Studies	ARMY		NAVY		AIR FORCE		OTHER DOD	
		Auto	Spec	Auto	Spec	Auto	Spec	Auto	Spec
Columbia	3	13	8	12	1	9	3	0	0
Texas	13	58	1	41	3	31	2	11	1
Alabama	2	8	0	4	0	3	0	0	0
Chicago	3	19	3	16	1	9	2	0	5
UCLA	7	24	1	23	2	13	4	0	2
Stanford	29	192	17	178	14	87	18	38	11
UC Berkeley	4	26	5	19	0	11	2	5	4
Cornell	4	23	6	25	2	17	5	0	3
MIT	33	180	26	176	22	104	37	22	5
Pennsylvania	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	100	543	67	494	45	284	73	76	31

C. Attitudes Toward The Academic Community

The suspicious attitudes characteristic of Defense/academic relations in the 60's seem to be gone, at least on the DOD side. Academics no longer appear to be perceived as radicals or as unsympathetic to the Defense effort, although academic fears about intelligence connections have not been entirely alleviated. Two recent examples indicate some latent suspicions. In one case, specialists in African affairs at nine U.S. African Studies Centers involved in the initial phases of the General Defense Intelligence Program (GDIP) Language and Area Study Program last year rejected DIA proposals to send DIA analysts studying at those centers overseas under university sponsorship. This reaction arose from a fear that this open intelligence connection might damage sensitive relationships in xenophobic African areas. The centers did not, however, object to contractual relations between their faculty members and GDIP agencies. In another instance, a DIA request for proposals under its Defense Academic Research Support Program (see D, below) provoked a negative response for Middle East scholars who feared that participation in this program might make them appear to be "handmaidens" of American strategy and intelligence interests, and thus jeopardize their own research activities in that area.

These incidents, perhaps atypical, do not seem to have aroused much resentment or suspicions within the Defense intelligence community, especially since other, more favorable signs are also in evidence. For example, NSA training officials state that their language cooperation and training programs have been more than welcomed on campuses, with no negative incidents reported. Thus, none of the intelligence officers interviewed by the SRI study team evidenced hostility toward academe. At worst, the academic world was judged to be "out-of-sync" with the specialized and highly specific needs of the Defense intelligence system.

D. Corrective Programs

1. General Defense Intelligence Program: Third World Language and Area Studies Initiative

The General Defense Intelligence Program (GDIP) -- essentially all intelligence agencies, the Services, and the Unified and Specified Commands, except the NSA-led cryptological community — has initiated an experimental language-and-area studies program. Its purpose is to allow GDIP personnel greater access to what is available from academe. This program provides job related, advanced third world area and language studies to defense analysts, and contracts unclassified scholarly research in support of analysis of third world conditions and events. The program also sponsors and conducts scholar/analyst colloquia between analysts and scholars in the academic community, and expects to develop and apply Defense Department-wide data systems to identify and assess defense language and area expertise within DOD. Finally, this program hopes to encourage development and better use of language instruction proficiency, maintenance, and testing for defense linguists for languages not commonly taught.

The GDIP studies program is projected to become fully operational in 1987. The 1982-83 period was one of pilot projects; 1984 is to be a period of evaluation. The lessons learned will be applied in 1985, with 1986 being the year of final preparation. Although the experimental GDIP program may become a large and important training program, it is not designed to become the exclusive language and area program or funding conduit for all the GDIP agencies.

The GDIP studies program is focused on the third world. It parallels the Soviet and Slavic areas program overseen by the Director of Net Assessments, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Neither program covers China and Japan, although Korea and Koreans are apparently included within the scope of the GDIP program.

Priorities for language and area study are established by identifying: neglected countries; areas where better analysis is needed or the data base is inadequate; regions where there is a shortage of linguists or area specialists, zones of potential military-political turmoil; areas of countries of growing significance to U.S. security, or places where there is an uncommonly taught language of growing importance.

Established priority regions for fiscal years 1982-83 were sub-Sarahan Africa and the Middle East. South/Southeast Asia and South and Central America will be the emphasis areas for 1984-85.

GDIP language training needs are identified in a variety of ways. These include the proportion of the population that uses a given language, the official status of the language (primary or secondary), the extent of use in government or official communications or broadcasting, whether it was used for instruction at the primary or seconday level, the current availability of instruction in the U.S. and overseas, and its potential adoption for technical use, not to mention the trends in usage for publication, especially for scholarly works.

GDIP has two distinct components called the Defense Advanced Language and Area Studies Program (DALASP) and the Defense Academic Research Support Program (DARSP). Together, these programs represent expenditures of some $1 million annually for language and area studies. This is roughly four times what the Soviet and Slavic area program spends annually.

Although there were 20 students planned for FY 1983 DALASP programs, only 5 were actually identified and funded because of a late program start. The DARSP program negotiated 9 research contracts in 1983 (5 in 1982) and 8 are planned for 1984. Both programs are expected to stay at our near these planning levels because of imposed resource limitations over the next few years.

a. Defense Advanced Language and Area Studies Program (DALASP)

DALASP is open to all civilian and military personnel in DIA, the Services, and the unified and specific commands, that is, all qualified civilian and military DOD personnel outside the cryptological community. It is a program of area education and language training usually at a civilian university. The DALASP program combines advanced study of third world regions and countries with training in a major indigenous language, in order for defense area specialists or linguists to acquire more background knowledge and better language skills for major indigenous third world languages. Another purpose is expanded GDIP agency access to scholars and current academic research.

DALASP education and training takes place at an approved college or university with a recognized area and language study program concentration in the target area and language. A flexible program, it offers either a degree or non-degree track at the graduate level, and full-time 1-2 year training with the possibility of extension. DALASP also offers part-time language proficiency support, maintenance and improvement opportunities, and special language course work where necessary. In-country research-and-study options are available, although this feature has not yet been taken advantage of; so is the possibility of overseas academic study. This full-cost program pays for travel, tuition, books, fees, language tape and computer assisted instruction, and for manuscript typing. It also pays the salaries of authorized temporary-hire personnel to replace DALASP students in full-time training of one year or more.

To be eligible for the DALASP program, students must: be "retainable," have suitable in-service experience, meet graduate admissions standards, and meet such course entrance requirements as the educational or training institution might set. They must display aptitude for foreign language study by evidence of successful previous study and mastery of a foreign language, or by a score of 100 or better on the Defense Language Aptitude test battery administered by DLI, or a score of 60 or better on the modern language aptitude test (MLAT) administered by the Foreign Service Institute.

The DALASP student/candidate must submit a research plan which includes academic work or research on the politics, history, economics, society, or geography of the region of concentration, and a plan of intensive study of a major language indigenous to that region or country. The ultimate program purpose or hope is to insure that all qualified third world analysts receive periodic DALASP training. The desired standard will be one year of training for five years of service.

A temporary fill-in position program provides replacements for DALASP selectees. Under this program the office providing a DALASP trainee may hire a temporary replacement through the Inter-Governmental Personnel Act, or a scholar-expert on sabbatical from a non-government educational or research institution, providing that there is no conflict of interest and the necessary security clearances can be obtained in time to fill the billet on schedule.

b. Defense Academic Research Support Program (DARSP)

As noted above, the Defense Academic Research Support Program contracts for unclassified publishable research. Topics are suggested by DIA, the Services, and the Unified and Specified Commands, or are volunteered by potential researchers. DARSP also runs colloquia for analysts, with diplomats, business representatives, and academics. The DARSP Program Research opportunities are advertised periodically in the Commerce Business Daily, most recently on the 7th of June 1983. Generic topics which exemplify the types of analysis that might be sought on all regions under the DARSP program include: (1) stability and effectiveness of socio-economic and politico-military systems and processes; (2) characteristics of leaders, leadership, and decision-making; (3) cultural, religious, economic, geographic, or other determinants of domestic and foreign policies; (4) sources of inter-regional and national conflict and tension; (5) origins and characteristics of insurgencies, liberation movements or groups, terror and terrorists; (6) the demonstrated or predictable impact of regional organizations (e.g., ASEAN, OAS) upon national, regional, social, political, economic, or military affairs; (7) socio-political and economic roles of military and para-military forces; (8) characteristics and manifestations of foreign influence within and upon those regions and states; (9) factors affecting the states' and regions' agricultural and industrial development. Analysis requested could include development and application of descriptive or causal predictive models.

Specific DARSP topics for a particular year are identified by a technical working group usually headed by the relevant area Defense Intelligence Officer with the cooperation of DIA and Service analysts. The working group also considers unsolicited proposals. Each study topic is submitted to the State Department for policy review and U.S. foreign policy implications. Then, after a literature search, a procurement request is prepared by the Program office in DIA. The Request for Proposal (RFP) is then developed by the Virginia Contracting Activity, which is the procurement arm of DIA, published in the Commerce Business Daily (CBD), and then sent to selected sources and respondents to the CBD Notice. Responses to the RFP are then evaluated and scored by the technical working group. Finally, fixed price contracts are negotiated with the winning proponent.

c. Initial Program Results

After nearly two years of experience with the program, GDIP officials appear to be enthusiastic, and continue to support its twin goals of better links to academe and improved GDIP community understanding of the Third World. One problem with DALASP has been the difficulty of making the Services aware of opportunities in time for them to identify DALASP students and select their temporary replacements. In the DARSP program, research quality generally has been satisfactory, but with some criticisms of the content, research applicability and format of the finished research studies.

2. OSD Sponsored Soviet and Eastern European Language and Area Studies Program

In the late 1970s, the Department of Defense became concerned over the national decline affecting Soviet studies, particularly the capacity for basic research in the U.S.S.R. and Eastern Europe. What emerged in 1978 after several years of discussion among government officials and scholars across the country was the National Council for Soviet and East European Research: a federally funded, non-profit autonomous academic corporation whose purpose is to develop and sustain a long-term program of basic research on a national scale dealing with policy issues and questions of Soviet and East European social, political, economic, and historical development.

The Council provides, through national competitions, research funds provided by Government agencies (notably DOD) to independent scholars via research contracts with their universities. The National Council consists of a Board of Trustees drawn from those universities with major Soviet and Eastern European programs such as Columbia, Harvard, and Indiana Universities. The Council thus provides an "entry point" to the DOD where scholars can compete for research funds, as well as a clearinghouse for government and academic interests in Soviet and Eastern European fields.

3. NSA Programs

Thanks in large measure to the authority granted by PL 97-89 (see Appendix D) the National Security Agency has embarked on a number of external programs designed to provide language training for its employees, to support research in linguistics and related pedagogy, to encourage language study by potential employees, and otherwise offer outside educational opportunities to its personnel. Most of NSA's outreach efforts in these areas are administered through four programs: the NSA Language Program, the NSA Cooperative Education Program, the Summer Program in Innovative Cryptologic Education (SPICE), and the Area Studies to Understand Today's Events (ASTUTE) program. These programs involve funds in excess of one million dollars.

a. PL 97-89

Section 602 of PL 97-89 authorized NSA to provide language and language-related training and instruction for military and civilian cryptologic personnel either through government or nongovernment facilities "that furnish training and instruction useful in the fields of language and foreign affairs," to support such nongovernmental programs through contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, and to hire or contract individuals to serve as language instructors, linguists, or special language project personnel. For language skill maintenance, NSA was further authorized to pay tuition and other expenses for civilian cryptologists undergoing language and language-related training, orientation, or instruction, and to provide incentive pay. NSA also received authority to establish a cryptologic civilian reserve, to pay tuition and other expenses for language and language-related training of reservists. And finally, NSA could pay tuition and other expenses for language training of family members of military and civilian cryptologists assigned overseas when such instruction was not available at government facilities.

b. NSA Language Program

In furtherance of its interests in foreign languages and language instruction, and as authorized by PL 97-89, within the past year NSA has inaugurated a program to provide financial support for various foreign language and language-related programs through contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements. Its primary purpose is to promote the understanding and documentation of languages and to develop new or improved language reference works (including dictionaries of non-written languages), teaching methodologies, and courses. The development of new teaching technologies — such as independent study training packages or audiovisual or computerized training technologies -- is also of interest. The focus is mainly on languages of the Middle East, the Far East, Southwest Asia, North and Sub-Saharan Africa, and Eastern Europe.

To this end, NSA invites proposals for nongovernmental educational institutions for projects that will: (1) lead to a significant breakthrough or development within the language field or related fields; (2) lead to innovations or significant improvements in documentation, language training, course development, instruction, or related fields; or (3) continue a significant program in language training, instruction, or related fields. More than half a dozen proposals have been received so far, and contracts have been granted to three or four universities.

c. NSA Cooperative Education Program

Since 1982, NSA has developed a program of cooperative language training with 45 colleges and universities throughout the United States. This program, the NSA Cooperative Education Program, or COOP, involves selecting students majoring in desirable languages and offering them temporary employment (usually at NSA, in Fort Meade, MD), the earnings from which will allow them to finance an additional year of language training. The Agency hopes thereby to identify potential linguists at an early stage and expose them to career opportunities. NSA intends to finance 20 such students in 1984, all of whom may be employed permanently thereafter.

NSA's initial concept called for selecting schools that, in its judgment, had demonstrable commitments to excellence in foreign language instruction, particularly those with offerings in languages not commonly taught. The program began with a pilot project of cooperation with 15 schools selected on the basis of a 1980 survey by the Linguistic Society of America. All of these schools taught French, Spanish, German, and Russian, plus those additional languages listed on the following chart that were of special interest to NSA. Several schools, indicated by an asterisk, also offer instruction in one or more sub-Saharan African languages.

5

d. SPICE

NSA's Summer program in Innovative Cryptologic Education (SPICE) is not entirely language-oriented, although it does feature funding for some summer language training and makes use of foreign languages in presenting non-language information. The program consists of internal courses on a wide variety of subjects of current professional or general interest, such as Latin America or arms control. Outside speakers can be experts in their fields from the academic world or professionals from within the government, including some from within NSA. Technical or specialized NSA-oriented courses are also included. For example, the China in the 80's Program which took place from Friday, May 6, through Wednesday, August 10, 1983, had lectures and seminars with such titles as Chinese Languages in Transition, Update in the Chinese Language, Peking Today, the PRC Economy, Sino-American Cultural Exchanges, The Quest for Freedom, Reflections of a Chinese Diplomat, Dealing with the Two Chinas, and others. All seminars were conducted in Chinese.

Those who wished to concentrate on languages were offered courses in intensive and basic Chinese, intensive intermediate Chinese, or intensive advanced Chinese. The language courses were presented by the Johns-Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies in Washington, D.C., at Fort Meade.

SPICE: UNIVERSITIES AND LANGUAGES

American U.	Hindi, Italian
Cornell U.	Arabic, Bulgarian, Burmese, Cambodian, Chinese, Czech, Dutch, Greek, Hindi, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Serbo-Croatian, Thai, Turkish, Vietnamese.
George Mason U.	Special programs in Korean and Vietnamese.
George Washington U.	Chinese, Italian, Japanese, Polish, Serbo-Croatian.
Indiana U.*	Afrikaans, Arabic, Azerbaijani, Bulgarian, Chinese, Czech, Dutch, Greek, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mongolian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovenian, Turkish.
U. of Maryland College Park	Chinese, Dutch, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese.
U. of Maryland Baltimore Co.	
U. of Michigan*	Arabic, Azerbaijani, Burmese, Chinese, Czech, Dutch, Greek, Hindi-Urdu, Hungarian, Indonesian, Italian, Japanese, Kurdish, Malay, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Serbo-Croatian, Thai, Turkish, Urdo.
Michigan State U.*	Amharic, Arabic, Chinese, Italian, Japanese, Portuguese.
Morgan State U.	Arabic
College of Notre Dame of Md.	Italian
Ohio State U.*	Arabic, Chinese, Greek, Italian, Japanese, Macedonian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovak, Slovenian Turkish.

SPICE: UNIVERSITIES AND LANGUAGES (cont'd)

U. of Pittsburgh*	Afghan-Farsi, Afrikaans, Amharic, Arabic, Bulgarian, Czech, Dutch, Greek, Hindi, Hungarian, Indonesian, Korean, Malay, Nepali, Persian, Thai, Turkish, Vietnamese.
U. of Texas*	Arabic, Bulgarian, Chinese, Greek, Hindi, Italian, Japanese, Macedonian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovak, Slovenian, Turkish.
U. of Washington	Arabic, Bulgarian, Chinese, Czech, Greek, Hindi-Urdu, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Mongolian, Persian, Polish, Portuguese, Ronamian, Serbo-Croatian, Thai, Turkish.

NSA officials from the National Cryptological School are responsible for identifying outside speakers or instructors. These tend to be scholars or government officials with established reputations in their own fields. Although many of these come from universities in the Washington and Baltimore areas, others have been brought in from further afield.

e. ASTUTE

Finally, NSA has a lecture or colloquia series program entitled Area Studies to Understand Today's Events (ASTUTE), essentially a series of individual lectures, seminars or colloquia. Given NSA's broad definition of area, these can be organized on virtually any subject of current interest. Speakers are called from within the agency, the academic world, or elsewhere in the government. For example, an ambassador or other diplomat recently returned from a country of current interest may be asked to make a presentation. This program is very new and has only been in existence for a few months; it has yet to be fully organized and evaluated. Some early programs were put together by Brookings and held outside the NSA premises. As is the case with SPICE, institutions, speakers or organizers of colloquia are picked by their reputation within NSA and for their accessibility, rather than through any elaborate selection process or externalized request for services.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The generally declining state of language and language-related area training in the United States has been reflected in the difficulties encountered by the National Security Agency in recruiting, training and retaining qualified linguists to meet both routine and crisis demands of the nation's cryptological program. The non-cryptological elements of the defense intelligence community, that is, the Defense Intelligence Agency, the Services, and the Unified and Specified Commands, have also felt compelled to assure that language and area specialists requirements are identified more efficiently and that sufficient training is provided to sustain the necessary skills.

The National Security Agency operates its own language training programs; virtually all other DOD language training takes place at the Defense Language Institute (DLI), or under DLI auspices. Contracts with universities have proven impractical because the required languages are too esoteric or because the university language courses are not sufficiently intensive.

The recording of language skills is not uniform throughout the Department of Defense, within the intelligence community, or among the various Services. However, efforts are underway to code language skills for the Services in a mutually compatible form. There is no uniform way to code Defense intelligence civilian language skills, nor is there likely to be, for security reasons. Efforts at harmonization among the Services are underway because of DOD-level concern about the differences and incompatibilities among data bases. Although the utility of maintaining language skills is generally recognized, only the Army's Foreign Area Officers program, the Air Force Reserve Program, and NSA undertake aggressive and systematic language skill maintenance.

Area training for Navy and Air Force officers is provided by and large by the Naval Post-Graduate School. Most Army Foreign Area Officers attend the Army's Foreign Area Officer course at Ft. Bragg, N.C., and about half of these go on to graduate education at universities. Army and Marine Corps FAOs also must have in-country experience to qualify for this specialty. DIA civilian analysts are often hired because of their academic preparation in some particular area. This is also true of some NSA employees, although "area" in NSA terminology also means functional area (e.g., economics).

The Defense intelligence community receives support from the academic world both directly, in the form of quality educational processes, expert consultants and lecturers, monographic literature and scholarly research, and indirectly, through more general periodicals and scholarly publications. DOD intelligence personnel assume that this support will continue to be available to them and, while there is a reluctance in some academic circles to become associated with intelligence-related research, there is a generally positive attitude toward academia on the DOD side.

Efforts are underway to enhance direct relations with the academic community through experimental language and area studies programs focusing on the third world and the Soviet bloc. In addition, the National Security Agency has initiated external programs to provide language training for current and potential employees, and to support research in linguistics and related pedagogy.

These findings lead to the following conclusions:

- DOD efforts to improve the definition of needs and requirements for foreign language and area specialists should be pushed at the highest level. Better assessment of needs can promote more effective collaboration with external sources of foreign language and area expertise and assure that future requirements are met.
- Development of compatible DOD intelligence personnel data bases can improve the identification of intra-Service/DOD foreign language and area specialist talent and rationalize utilization of that talent.
- New mechanisms are required to improve career progression for foreign language and area study personnel to help attract and retain highly qualified and motivated intelligence officers; incentives are also needed to reward skill maintenance and improvement.
- Current DOD practices for procurement of external foreign language and area specialist resources should be reviewed in order to improve the utilization of such resources.
- The academic community should consider the creation of an independent clearinghouse to assist universities in identifying and responding to DOD requests for foreign language and area specialist assistance.
- DOD should consider developing a coordinated and regularly published bulletin to acquaint the academic community with opportunities to respond to the Department's needs for external assistance.

- University language schools should be encouraged to implement uniform, government-compatible language testing standards in order to improve DOD utilization of campus language training programs.

- The academic community should seek to improve understanding and responsiveness to specific DIA and NSA programs aimed at utilizing external foreign language and area specialist resources as possible prototypes for further DOD/academic cooperation.

- The academic community should not expect major new DOD funding for campus-based foreign language and area specialist programs. Rather, substantial new Federal bases of support for such programs are more likely to proceed with a broader government-wide level of support.

APPENDIX A

GLOSSARY

ACDA	Arms Control and Disarmament Agency
ACSI	Assistant Chief of Staff, Intelligence, United States Army (or Air Force)
AFIT	Air Force Institute of Technology
AID	Agency for International Development
ASTUTE	Area Studies to Understand Today's Events (NSA Training Program)
DALASP	Defense Advanced Language and Area Studies Program
DARSP	Defense Academic Research Support Program
DCI	Director of Central Intelligence
DIA	Defense Intelligence Agency
DISCAS	Defense Intelligence Civilian Access System
DLI	Defense Language Institute
DOD	Department of Defense
DTIC	Defense Technical Information Center
FAO	Foreign Area Officer - Army Officer secondary specialty
FBI	Federal Bureau of Investigation
FLAS	Foreign Language and Area Studies
FLTC	Foreign Language Training Committee
FSI	Foreign Service Institute, Department of State
GDIP	General Defense Intelligence Programs
HUMINT	"Human" Intelligence
ICDP	Intelligence Career Development Program
ILR	Interagency Language Roundtable
NATO	North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NPGS	Navy Post Graduate School

NSA	National Security Agency
RFP	Request for Proposal
Services	Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine Corps
SPICE	Summer Program in Innovative Crypotologic Education (NSA Training Program)
Unified and Specified Commands	Highest level Joint Service Commands
USAF	U.S. Air Force
USIA	U.S. Information Agency
USMA	U.S. Military Academy
USMC	U.S. Marine Corps

APPENDIX B

BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Academy of Political and Social Science -- Annals V. 447-449 1980.

Axelrod, Joseph, and Bigelow, Donald N., Resources for Language and Area Studies: A Report on an Inventory of the Language and Area Centers Supported by the National Defense Education Act of 1958. (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1962).

Berryman, Sue E., et al., Foreign Language and International Studies Specialists: The Marketplace and National Policy (Santa Monica, California: Rand Corporation, September 1979).

Defense Language Institute, Accreditation Self-Study Report, Foreign Language Center, Presidio of Monterey, California, June 1978.

Griffin, James (of Citibank), Statement Submitted for Congressional Record on Government Funding of Area Studies, to House Subcommittee on Appropriations/Labor-HEW, April 7, 1976.

Hayden, Rose L., Funding Advanced Foreign Area Research: An Unmet Agenda, before the House Subcommittee on International Security and Scientific Affairs, March 22, 1978.

__________, Statement Submitted for Congressional Record by the International Education Project of the American Council on Education, to House Sub-committee on Appropriations/Labor-HEW, April 7, 1976.

Lambert, Richard D., Languages and Area Studies Review Sponsored by the Social Sciences Research Council and published as Monograph 17 of the American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, 1973.

National Council on Foreign Language and International Studies, Report of the Task Force on National Manpower Targets for Advanced Research on Foreign Areas, 1981.

President's Commission on Foreign Languages and International Studies, Strength Through Wisdom: A Critique of U.S. Capability, A Report to the President (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, November 1979), and Background papers.

Rosenau, James N., A Survey of the Status of International Comparative Studies and Recommendations Concerning National Needs and Priorities (A final report). International Studies Association. Published as International Studies and the Social Sciences: Problems, Priorities and Prospects in the U.S. (Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage Publications, Inc., 1973).

U.S. General Accounting Office, Federally-Financed Research and Communication on Soviet Affairs: Capabilities and Needs (Washington, D.C.: July 2, 1980).

———————, Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General of the U.S.: Study of Foreign Languages and Related Areas--Federal Support---Administrative Need, September 13, 1978.

———————, "More Competence in Foreign Languages Needed by Federal Personnel Working Overseas," (ID-80-31, Apr. 15, 1980).

Walsh, Donald D., The 1963 National Defense Language Institutes: A Summary of Evaluations. MLA, 1964.

———————, The National Defense Language Institutes: A Critical Report, MLA, PMLA, 80:2:33-36, May 1965.

APPENDIX C*

DOD INTELLIGENCE FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES - TOP 10 LANGUAGES

Language	FY 1982 Requirements	FY 1982 Capabilities	FY 1983 Requirements	FY 1983 Capabilities	FY 1984 Requirements
Russian	4384	3635	4483	3559	4245
German	1075	1011	1039	989	922
Spanish	880	659	834	777	819
Korean	795	678	806	626	873
Arabic	713	550	776	520	775
Polish	264	170	272	179	215
Chinese	571	642	561	579	549
Czech	373	293	357	277	299
French	173	160	200	184	180
Italian	43	36	42	42	43

---

* While these tables represent the "best available" data on DoD intelligence foreign language requirements and capabilities, this data has been widely criticized as "too soft" to be reliably used for planning purposes.

DOD NON-INTELLIGENCE FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES - TOP 10

Language	FY 1982		FY 1983		FY 1984
	Requirements	Capabilities	Requirements	Capabilities	Requirements
Russian	25	13	26	14	27
German	833	490	859	492	843
Spanish	1411	1184	1389	1186	1196
Korean	85	68	84	70	84
Arabic	66	60	63	60	77
Polish	3	4	6	4	4
Chinese	25	25	22	27	21
Czech	1	4	2	4	7
French	133	122	112	122	122
Italian	232	273	226	274	226

DOD TOTAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES - TOP 10 LANGUAGES

Language	FY 1982 Requirements	FY 1982 Capabilities	FY 1983 Requirements	FY 1983 Capabilities	FY 1984 Requirements	Total Resources	Total Resources Level 4&5
Russian	4409	3649	4509	3573	4272	6253	87
German	1908	1501	1898	1481	1765	14926	1121
Spanish	2291	1843	2223	1963	2015	26436	1992
Korean	880	727	890	696	957	1576	115
Arabic	779	610	839	580	852	1122	34
Polish	267	174	278	183	219	600	57
Chinese	596	667	583	606	570	1574	71
Czech	374	297	359	281	306	469	15
French	306	282	312	306	301	13483	326
Italian	275	309	268	316	269	1942	121

DOD LDP* FILL RATES - TOP 10 LANGUAGES

Language	FY 1982 Intelligence	FY 1982 Non-Intelligence	FY 1982 Total	FY 1983 Intelligence	FY 1983 Non-Intelligence	FY 1983 Total
Russian	82.9%	56.%	82.8%	79.4%	53.8%	79.2%
German	94.	58.8	78.7	95.2	57.3	78.
Spanish	74.9	83.9	80.4	93.2	85.4	88.3
Korean	85.3	80.	82.6	77.7	83.3	78.2
Arabic	77.1	90.9	78.3	67.	95.2	69.1
Polish	64.4	133.3	65.2	65.8	66.6	65.8
Chinese	112.4	100.	111.9	103.2	122.7	103.9
Czech	78.5	400.	79.4	77.6	200.	78.3
French	92.5	91.7	92.1	92.	108.9	98.1
Italian	83.7	117.7	112.4	100.	121.2	117.9

---

*Language Designated Positions

DOD FOREIGN LANGUAGE INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES - OTHER LANGUAGES

Language	FY 1982 Requirements	FY 1982 Capabilities	FY 1983 Requirements	FY 1983 Capabilities	FY 1984 Requirements
Adigey	-	-	-	-	-
Afrikaans	13	10	14	15	13
Albanian	4	2	4	4	4
Amashi	-	-	2	-	-
Amharic	7	2	7	4	7
Armenian	-	-	-	-	-
Basque	-	-	-	-	-
Belorussian	-	-	-	-	-
Bengali	1	-	1	-	1
Bulgarian	21	18	21	19	24
Burmese	1	1	2	1	1
Cambodian	9	4	9	5	9
Chechen	-	-	-	-	-
Danish	5	1	6	5	5
Dutch	6	5	7	9	6
Dutch-Creole	-	-	-	-	-
Estonian	-	-	-	-	-
Ewondo	-	-	-	-	-
Fang	-	-	-	-	-
Finnish	2	1	4	4	4
Flemish	-	-	-	-	-
Frisian	-	-	-	-	-
Galla	-	-	-	-	-
Greek	15	14	21	24	18
Guamanian	-	-	-	-	-
Guarani	-	-	-	-	-
Haitian-Creole	-	-	-	-	-
Hausa	-	-	-	-	-
Hawaiian	-	-	-	-	-
Hebrew	122	92	127	65	137
Hindi	4	2	4	2	4
Hindustani					
Hungarian	27	14	26	19	27
Icelandic	-	-	-	-	-

DOD FOREIGN LANGUAGE INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES - OTHER LANGUAGES (cont'd)

Language	FY 1982 Requirements	FY 1982 Capabilities	FY 1983 Requirements	FY 1983 Capabilities	FY 1984 Requirements
Ilocano	-	-	-	-	-
Indonesian	16	13	20	13	19
Irish	-	-	-	-	-
Japanese	109	85	113	89	116
Kambatta	-	-	-	-	-
Kanarese	-	-	-	-	-
Kashubian	-	-	-	1	-
Kissi	-	-	-	4	-
Kituba	-	-	-	-	-
Kurdish	3	1	1	1	1
Lao	4	2	4	2	4
Latin	-	-	-	-	-
Latvian	-	-	-	-	-
Lingala	-	-	-	-	-
Lithuanian	-	-	-	-	-
Loma	-	-	-	-	-
Lunda	-	-	-	-	-
Macedonian	-	-	-	-	-
Malay	3	3	4	4	3
Malayalan	-	-	-	-	-
Mandingo-Dioula	-	-	-	-	-
Mongolian	-	-	-	-	-
Norwegian	7	7	7	8	7
Old English	-	-	-	-	-
Pampangan	-	-	-	-	-
Persian	64	40	85	49	89
Pidgin English	-	-	-	-	-
Ponapean	-	-	-	-	-
Portuguese	40	33	46	39	44
Provencal	-	-	-	-	-
Punjabi	-	-	-	-	-
Pushtu	4	-	5	3	5
Quechua	-	-	-	-	-
Rajasthani	-	-	-	-	-

DOD FOREIGN LANGUAGE INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES - OTHER LANGUAGES (cont'd)

Language	FY 1982 Requirements	FY 1982 Capabilities	FY 1983 Requirements	FY 1983 Capabilities	FY 1984 Requirements
Romance Langs	-	1	1	1	1
Romanian	39	56	36	43	33
Romany	-	-	-	-	-
Samoan	-	-	-	-	-
Sango	-	-	-	1	-
Sara	-	-	-	-	-
Scotch-Gaelic	-	-	-	-	-
Serbo-Croatian	47	52	45	42	48
Shan	3	1	3	1	3
Shona	-	-	-	-	-
Sidamo	-	-	-	-	-
Sinhalese	-	-	-	-	-
Slovak	1	1	1	1	1
Slovenian	-	-	-	-	-
Somali	4	2	9	3	12
Sotho	-	-	-	2	-
South American	-	-	-	-	-
South Asian	-	-	-	-	-
Spanish-Creole	-	-	2	4	-
Subsaharan African	-	-	-	-	-
Swahili	1	1	6	1	7
Swedish	2	2	4	4	5
Syriac	-	-	-	-	-
Tagalog	-	-	2	2	-
Tartar	-	-	-	-	-
Thai	16	16	17	21	18
Trukese	-	-	-	-	-
Tswa	1	-	1	-	1
Turkish	53	39	56	53	57
Ukrainian	-	-	-	1	-
Urdu	4	1	8	1	11
Vai	-	-	-	-	-
Vietnamese	136	115	151	118	154
Visayan	-	-	-	-	-
Unspec/Uncoded/Other	581	-	851	-	1791

DOD FOREIGN LANGUAGE NON-INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES - OTHER LANGUAGES

Language	FY 1982 Requirements	FY 1982 Capabilities	FY 1983 Requirements	FY 1983 Capabilities	FY 1984 Requirements
Adigey	4	-	4	-	4
Afrikaans	2	1	2	1	2
Albanian	-	-	-	2	-
Amashi	-	-	-	-	-
Amharic	-	-	-	-	-
Armenian	-	-	-	-	-
Basque	-	-	-	-	-
Belorussian	-	-	-	-	-
Bengali	1	-	-	-	-
Bulgarian	1	-	1	-	1
Burmese	2	-	1	-	1
Cambodian	-	-	-	2	-
Chechen	1	1	1	1	1
Danish	19	18	19	19	19
Dutch	16	13	15	20	16
Dutch-Creole	-	-	-	-	-
Estonian	-	-	-	-	-
Ewondo	-	-	-	-	-
Fang	-	-	-	-	-
Finnish	8	6	6	6	6
Flemish	19	14	19	16	19
Frisian	-	-	-	-	-
Galla	-	-	-	-	-
Greek	49	44	46	49	46
Guamanian	5	4	5	4	5
Guarani	-	-	-	-	-
Haitian-Creole	1	1	1	1	1
Hausa	-	-	-	-	-
Hawaiian	-	-	-	-	-
Hebrew	8	4	7	4	7
Hindi	3	3	3	3	3
Hindustani					
Hungarian	3	-	3	3	3
Icelandic	-	-	-	-	-

DOD FOREIGN LANGUAGE NON-INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES - OTHER LANGUAGES (cont'd)

Language	FY 1982 Requirements	FY 1982 Capabilities	FY 1983 Requirements	FY 1983 Capabilities	FY 1984 Requirements
Ilocano	-	-	-	-	-
Indonesian	19	9	19	13	19
Irish	-	-	-	-	-
Japanese	29	21	29	26	18
Kambatta	-	-	-	-	-
Kanarese	-	-	-	-	-
Kashubian	-	-	-	-	-
Kissi	-	-	-	-	-
Kituba	-	-	-	-	-
Kurdish	-	-	-	-	-
Lao	-	-	-	-	-
Latin	-	-	-	-	-
Latvian	-	-	-	-	-
Lingala	-	-	-	-	-
Lithuanian	-	-	-	-	-
Loma	-	-	-	-	-
Lunda	2	-	2	1	2
Macedonian	-	-	-	-	-
Malay	2	-	1	-	-
Malayalam	-	-	-	-	-
Mandingo-Dioula	-	-	-	-	-
Mongolian	-	-	-	-	-
Norwegian	5	4	5	4	4
Old English	-	-	-	-	-
Pampangan	-	-	-	-	-
Persian	13	5	7	5	7
Pidgin English	-	-	-	-	-
Ponapean	-	-	-	-	-
Portuguese	44	28	43	49	42
Provencal	-	-	-	-	-
Punjabi	-	-	-	-	-
Pushtu	-	-	-	-	-
Quechua	-	-	-	-	-
Rajasthani	-	-	-	-	-

DOD FOREIGN LANGUAGE NON-INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES - OTHER LANGUAGES (cont'd)

Language	FY 1982 Requirements	FY 1982 Capabilities	FY 1983 Requirements	FY 1983 Capabilities	FY 1984 Requirements
Romance Langs	-	-	-	-	-
Romanian	3	2	2	3	2
Romany	-	-	-	-	-
Samoan	1	-	-	-	-
Sango	-	-	-	-	-
Sara	-	-	-	1	-
Scotch-Gaelic	-	-	-	-	-
Serbo-Croatian	27	28	27	29	27
Shan	-	-	-	-	-
Shona	-	-	-	1	-
Sidamo	-	-	-	-	-
Sinhalese	-	-	-	-	-
Slovak	-	-	-	-	-
Slovenian	-	-	-	-	-
Somali	-	-	-	-	-
Sotho	-	-	-	21	-
South American	-	-	-	-	-
South Asian	-	-	-	-	-
Spanish-Creole	-	-	-	14	-
Subsaharan African	1	-	1	-	1
Swahili	-	-	-	-	-
Swedish	5	3	5	3	5
Syriac	-	-	-	-	-
Tagalog	7	18	6	19	6
Tartar	-	-	-	-	-
Thai	22	19	21	24	21
Trukese	-	-	-	-	-
Tswa	-	-	-	-	-
Turkish	70	36	71	55	73
Ukrainian	-	-	-	1	-
Urdu	-	-	-	-	-
Vai	-	-	-	-	-
Vietnamese	1	10	-	6	-
Visayan	-	-	-	-	-
Unspec/Uncoded/Other	2006	-	2006	-	2440

DOD TOTAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES - OTHER LANGUAGES

Language	FY 1982 Requirements	FY 1982 Capabilities	FY 1983 Requirements	FY 1983 Capabilities	FY 1984 Requirements	Total Resources Available	Total Resources Level 4&5
Adigey	4	-	4	-	4	-	-
Afrikaans	15	11	16	16	15	30	7
Albanian	4	2	4	6	4	16	1
Amashi	-	-	2	-	-	1	
Amharic	7	2	7	4	7	8	
Armenian	1	-	-	-	-	6	1
Basque	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Belorussian	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Bengali	2	-	1	-	1	1	
Bulgarian	22	18	22	19	25	42	1
Burmese	3	1	3	1	2	13	
Cambodian	9	4	9	7	9	29	2
Chechen	1	1	1	1	1	3	1
Danish	24	19	25	24	24	90	6
Dutch	22	18	22	29	22	261	25
Dutch-Creole	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Estonian	-	-	-	-	-	7	2
Ewondo	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Fang	-	-	-	-	-	2	
Finnish	10	7	10	10	10	76	2
Flemish	19	14	19	16	19	17	2
Frisian	-	-	-	-	-	7	
Galla	-	-	-	-	-	2	
Greek	64	58	67	73	64	536	41
Guamanian	5	4	5	4	5	10	1
Guarani	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Haitian-Creole	1	1	1	1	1	8	3
Hausa	-	-	-	1	-	1	
Hawaiian	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Hebrew	130	96	134	69	144	197	8
Hindi	7	21	7	5	7	24	4
Hindustani							
Hungarian	30	17	29	22	30	165	21

DOD TOTAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES - OTHER LANGUAGES (cont'd)

Language	FY 1982 Requirements	FY 1982 Capabilities	FY 1983 Requirements	FY 1983 Capabilities	FY 1984 Requirements	Total Resources Available	Total Resources Level 4&5
Icelandic	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Ilocano	-	-	-	-	-	14	2
Indonesian	35	21	39	26	38	112	6
Irish	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Japanese	138	106	142	115	134	1005	34
Kambatta	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Kanarese	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Kashubian	-	-	-	1	-	2	1
Kissi	-	-	-	-	-	8	
Kituba	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Kurdish	3	1	1	1	1	2	
Lao	4	2	4	2	4	34	1
Latvian	-	-	-	-	-	6	2
Lingala	-	-	-	-	-	6	
Lithuanian	-	-	-	-	-	19	3
Loma	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Lunda	2	-	2	1	2	2	
Macedonian	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Malay	5	3	5	4	4	41	
Malayalan	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Mandingo-Dioula	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Mongolian	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Norwegian	12	11	12	12	11	188	8
Pampangan	-	-	-	-	-	2	
Persian	77	45	92	54	96	175	7
Ponapean	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Portuguese	84	61	89	88	86	1353	84
Provencal	-	-	-	-	-	5	
Punjabi	-	-	-	-	-	2	1
Pushtu	4	-	5	3	5	3	
Quechua	-	-	-	-	-	2	
Rajasthani	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Romanian	42	58	38	46	35	121	2

DOD TOTAL FOREIGN LANGUAGE INTELLIGENCE REQUIREMENTS AND CAPABILITIES - OTHER LANGUAGES (cont'd)

Language	FY 1982 Requirements	FY 1982 Capabilities	FY 1983 Requirements	FY 1983 Capabilities	FY 1984 Requirements	Total Resources Available	Total Resources Level 4&5
Romany	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Samoan	1	-	-	-	-	12	
Sango	-	-	-	1	-	2	
Sara	-	-	-	1	-	1	
Scotch-Gaelic	-	-	-	-	-	3	
Serbo-Croatian	74	80	72	71	75	135	17
Shan	3	1	3	1	3	1	
Shona	-	-	-	1	-	1	
Sidamo	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Sinhalese	-	-	-	-	-	1	
Slovak	1	1	1	1	1	12	3
Slovenian	-	-	-	-	-	10	4
Somali	4	2	9	3	12	3	
Sotho	-	-	-	23	-	149	9
Spanish-Creole	-	-	2	18	2	39	
Swahili	1	1	6	1	7	12	
Swedish	7	5	9	7	10	108	12
Syriac	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Tagalog	7	18	8	21	6	9807	4489
Tartar	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Thai	38	25	38	45	39	449	24
Trukese	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Tswa	1	-	1	-	1	-	-
Turkish	123	75	127	108	130	290	5
Ukrainian	-	-	-	2	-	44	9
Urdu	4	1	8	1	11	28	3
Vai	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Vietnamese	137	125	152	124	155	2261	29
Visayan	-	-	-	-	-	2	-
Unspec/Uncoded/Other	2587	-	2857	-	4231	5	-

DOD LDP* RATES – OTHERS LANGUAGES

	FY 1982			FY 1983		
Language	Intelligence	Non-Intelligence	Total	Intelligence	Non-Intelligence	Total
Adigey	–	0.	0.	–	0.	0.
Afrikaans	76.9	50.	73.3	107.4	50.	100.
Albanian	50.	–	50.	100.	N/A	150.
Amashi	–	–	–	0.	–	0.
Amharic	28.6	–	28.6	57.1	–	57.1
Armenian	–	–	–	–	–	–
Basque	–	–	–	–	–	–
Belorussian	–	–	–	–	–	–
Bengali	0.	0.	0.	0.	–	0.
Bulgarian	85.7	0.	81.8	90.5	0.	86.4
Burmese	100.	0.	33.3	50.	0.	33.3
Cambodian	44.4	–	44.4	55.5	N/A	77.8
Chechen	–	100.	100.	–	100.	100.
Danish	20.	94.7	79.2	83.3	100.	96.
Dutch	83.3	81.25	81.8	128.6	133.3	131.8
Dutch-Creole	–	–	–	–	–	–
Estonian	–	–	–	–	–	–
Ewondo	–	–	–	–	–	–
Fang	–	–	–	–	–	–
Finnish	50.	75.	70.	100.	100.	100.
Flemish	–	73.7	73.7	–	84.2	84.2
Frisian	–	–	–	–	–	–
Galla	–	–	–	–	–	–
Greek	93.3	89.8	90.6	114.3	106.5	109.
Guamanian	–	80.	80.	–	80.	80.
Guarani	–	–	–	–	–	–
Haitian-Creole	–	100.	100.	–	100.	100.
Hausa	–	–	–	–	–	N/A
Hawaiian	–	–	–	–	–	–
Hebrew	88.5	50.	86.15	51.2	57.1	51.5

---

* Language Designated Positions

DOD LDP* RATES - OTHERS LANGUAGES (cont'd)

	FY 1982			FY 1983		
Language	Intelligence	Non-Intelligence	Total	Intelligence	Non-Intelligence	Total
Hindi	50.	100.	71.4	50.	100.	71.5
Hungarian	51.85	100.	56.7	73.1	100.	75.9
Icelandic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Ilocano	-	-	-	-	-	-
Indonesian	81.25	47.4	60.	65.	68.4	66.7
Irish	-	-	-	-	-	-
Japanese	78.	72.4	76.8	78.8	89.65	81.
Kambatta	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kanarese	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kashubian	-	-	-	N/A	-	N/A
Kissi	-	-	-	N/A	-	N/A
Kituba	-	-	-	-	-	-
Kurdish	33.3	-	33.3	100.	-	100.
Lao	50.	-	50.	50.	-	50.
Latvian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lingala	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lithuanian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Loma	-	-	-	-	-	-
Lunda	-	0.	0.	-	50.	50.
Macedonian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Malay	100.	0.	60.	100.	0.	80.
Malayalan	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mandingo-Dioula	-	-	-	-	-	-
Mongolian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Norwegian	100.	80.	91.7	114.3	80.	100.
Pampangan	-	-	-	-	-	-
Persian	62.5	38.5	58.4	57.6	71.4	58.7
Ponapean	-	-	-	-	-	-
Portuguese	82.5	63.6	72.6	84.8	114.	98.9
Provencal	-	-	-	-	-	-

* Language Designated Positions

DOD LDP* RATES - OTHERS LANGUAGES (cont'd)

	FY 1982			FY 1983		
Language	Intelligence	Non-Intelligence	Total	Intelligence	Non-Intelligence	Total
Punjabi	-	-	-	-	-	-
Pushtu	0.	-	0.	60.	-	60.
Quechua	-	-	-	-	-	-
Rajasthani	-	-	-	-	-	-
Romanian	143.6	66.7	138.1	119.4	150.	121.
Romany	-	-	-	-	-	-
Samoan	-	0.	0.	-	-	-
Sango	-	-	-	N/A	-	N/A
Sara	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Scotch-Gaelic	-	-	-	-	-	-
Serbo-Croatian	110.6	103.7	108.1	93.3	107.4	98.6
Shan	33.3	-	33.3	33.3	-	33.3
Shona	-	-	-	-	N/A	N/A
Sidamo	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sinhalese	-	-	-	-	-	-
Slovak	100.	-	100.	100.	-	100.
Slovenian	-	-	-	-	-	-
Somali	50.	-	50.	33.3	-	33.3
Sotho	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	N/A
Spanish-Creole	-	-	-	200.	N/A	900.
Swahili	100.	-	100.	16.7	-	16.7
Swedish	100.	60.	71.4	100.	60.	77.8
Syriac	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tagalog	-	257.1	257.1	100.	316.7	262.5
Tartar	-	-	-	-	-	-
Thai	100.	86.4	65.8	123.5	114.3	118.4
Trukese	-	-	-	-	-	-
Tswa	0.	-	0.	0.	-	0.
Turkish	73.6	51.4	61.	94.6	77.5	85.
Ukrainian	-	-	-	N/A	N/A	N/A

* Language Designated Positions

DOD LDP* RATES - OTHERS LANGUAGES (cont'd)

	FY 1982			FY 1983		
Language	Intelligence	Non-Intelligence	Total	Intelligence	Non-Intelligence	Total
Urdu	25.	-	25.	12.5	-	12.5
Vai	-	-	-	-	-	-
Vietnamese	84.5	1000.	91.2	78.1	N/A	81.6
Visayan	-	-	-	-	-	-
Unspec/Uncoded/Other	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.

---

* Language Designated Positions

OVERALL DOD LDP* FILL RATES

	FY 1982			FY 1983		
	Intelligence	Non-Intelligence	Total	Intelligence	Non-Intelligence	Total
Top Ten	84.5	79.4	83.2	82.5	80.8	82.1
Other Languages	47.5	75.1	78.9	39.7	109.1	87.3
Overall	84.3	78.8	82.8	62.1	84.1	82.6

---

* Language Designated Positions

NON-INTELLIGENCE TOTALS

	FY 1982		FY 1983		FY 1984
	Requirements	Capabilities	Requirements	Capabilities	Requirements
Top Ten Languages	2814	2234	2789	2253	2607
Other Languages	393	295	372	406	507
Overall	3207	2529	3161	2659	3114

INTELLIGENCE TOTALS

	FY 1982		FY 1983		FY 1984
	Requirements	Capabilities	Requirements	Capabilities	Requirements
Top Ten Languages	9271	7834	9370	7732	8920
Other Languages	794	653	882	688	899
Overall	10065	8487	10252	8420	9819

TOTAL TOTALS

	FY 1982		FY 1983		FY 1984	Total	Total
	Requirements	Capabilities	Requirements	Capabilities	Requirements	Resources Available	Resources Level 4&5
Top Ten Languages	12085	10059	12159	9985	11526	68381	3940
Other Languages	1186	936	1253	1094	1262	18054	4887
Overall	13271	10995	13412	11079	12788	86435	8827

INTELLIGENCE LINGUIST RETENTION RATES

First Enlistment

Service	FY 79/80	FY 82/83	Change in Percentage Points
Army	34%	63%	+29
Navy	31%	46%	+15
Air Force	26.3%	54.3%	+28
Marine Corps	25%	32%	+ 7

Second Enlistment

Service	FY 79/80	FY 82/83	Change in Percentage Points
Army	71%	79%	+ 8
Navy	81%	81%	n.c.
Air Force	56.6%	77%	+20.4
Marine Corps	78%	81%	+ 3

APPENDIX D

Language Training & Cryptologic Linguistic Reserve Sections of Public Law 97-89

Title VI Section 602

LANGUAGE TRAINING AND CRYPTOLOGIC LINGUIST RESERVE PROGRAMS

Sec. 602. The National Security Agency Act of 1959 is amended — (1) by inserting after section 9 the following:

"Sec. 10. (a) The Director of the National Security Agency shall arrange for, and shall prescribe regulations concerning, language and language-related training programs for military and civilian cryptologic personnel. In establishing programs under this section for language and language-related training, the Director --

"(1) may provide for the training and instruction to be furnished, including functional and geographic area specializations;

"(2) may arrange for training and instruction through other Government agencies and, in any case in which appropriate training or instruction is unavailable through Government facilities, through nongovernmental facilities that furnish training and instruction useful in the fields of language and foreign affairs;

"(3) may support programs that furnish necessary language and language-related skills, including, in any case in which appropriate programs are unavailable at Government facilities, support through contracts, grants, or cooperation with nongovernmental educational institutions; and

"(4) may obtain by appointment or contract the services of individuals to serve as language instructors, linguists, or special language project personnel.

"(b)(1) In order to maintain necessary capability in foreign language skills and related abilities needed by the National Security Agency, the Director, without regard to subchapter IV of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, may provide special monetary or other incentives to encourage civilian cryptologic personnel of the Agency to acquire or retain proficiency in foreign languages or special related abilities needed by the Agency.

"(2) In order to provide linguistic training and support for cryptologic personnel, the Director --

"(A) may pay all or part of the tuition and other expenses related to the training of personnel who are assigned or detailed for language and language-related training, orientation, or instruction; and

"(B) may pay benefits and allowances to civilian personnel in accordance with chapters 57 and 59 of title 5, United States Code, and to military personnel in accordance with chapter 7 of title 37, United States Code, and applicable provisions of title 10, United

States Code, when such personnel are assigned to training at sites away from their designated duty station.

"(c)(1) To the extent not inconsistent, in the opinion of the Secretary of Defense, with the operation of military cryptologic reserve units and in order to maintain necessary capability in foreign language skills and related abilities needed by the National Security Agency, the Director may establish a cryptologic linguist reserve. The cryptologic linguist reserve may consist of former or retired civilian or military cryptologic personnel of the National Security Agency and of other qualified individuals, as determined by the Director of the Agency. Each member of the cryptologic linguist reserve shall agree that, during any period of emergency (as determined by the Director), the member shall return to active civilian status with the National Security Agency and shall perform such linguistic or linguistic-related duties as the Director may assign.

"(2) In order to attract individuals to become members of the cryptologic linguist reserve, the Director, without regard to subchapter IV of chapter 55 of title 5, United States Code, may provide special monetary incentives to individuals eligible to become members of the reserve who agree to become members of the cryptologic linguist reserve and to acquire or retain proficiency in foreign languages or special related abilities.

"(3) In order to provide training and support for members of the cryptologic linguist reserve, the Director --

"(A) may pay all or part of the tuition and other expenses related to the training of individuals in the cryptologic linguist reserve who are assigned or detailed for language and language-related training, orientation, or instruction; and

"(B) may pay benefits and allowances in accordance with chapters 57 and 59 of title 5, United States Code, to individuals in the cryptologic linguist reserve who are assigned to training at sites away from their homes or regular places of business.

"(dX1) The Director, before providing training under this section to any individual, may obtain an agreement with that individual that --

"(A) in the case of current employees, pertains to continuation of service of the employee, and repayment of the expenses of such training for failure to fulfill the agreement, consistent with the provisions of section 410S of title 5, United States Code; and

"(B) in the case of individuals accepted for membership in the cryptologic linguist reserve, pertains to return to service when requested, and repayment of the expenses of such training for failure to fulfill the agreement, consistent with the provisions of section 410S of title 5, United States Code.

"(2) The Director, under regulations prescribed under this section, may waive, in whole or in part, a right of recovery under an agreement made under this subsection if it is shown that the recovery would be against equity and good conscience or against the public interest.

"(e)(1) Subject to paragraph (2), the Director may provide to family members of military and civilian cryptologic personnel assigned to representational duties outside the United States, in anticipation of the assignment of such personnel outside the United States or while outside the United States, appropriate orientation and language training that is directly related to the assignment abroad.

"(2) Language training under paragraph (1) may not be provided to any individual through payment of the expenses of tuition or other cost of instruction at a non-Government educational institution unless appropriate instruction is not available at a Government facility.

"(f) The Director may waive the applicability of any provision of chapter 41 of title 5, United States Code, to any provision of this section if he finds that such waiver is important to the performance of cryptologic functions.

"(g) The authority of the Director to enter into contracts or to make grants under this section is effective for any fiscal year only to the extent that appropriate funds are available for such purpose.

"(h) Regulations issued pursuant to this section shall be submitted to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives and the Select Committee on Intelligence of the Senate before such regulations take effect.:; and

(2) by striking our "Sec. 10." before "The Director" and inserting in lieu thereof "(i)".

APPENDIX E

INVENTORY ON FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND AREA STUDIES

(For Use Within DOD Agencies Only)

I. Background

1. Rank/Grade for Military and Civilian Personnel: ____________________________

2. Current Position: ____________________

3. Current Office:

____

____

____

____

____

4. What is your primary task in your present job? (please check one)

A. Intelligence Collection (the gathering of potentially relevant data) ________

B. Intelligence Production (the translation of data into finished intelligence products through screening and analysis) ________

C. Dissemination (delivery of finished products to intelligence consumers) ________

D. Foreign Liaison ________

E. Foreign Military Assistance ________

F. Operations ________

G. Other (please explain briefly)__________ ________

____

H. Policy Analysis and Formulation ________

I. Intelligence Requirements (identification of intelligence needs) ________

II. Education and Training

5. Academic Education: Please indicate the degrees you obtained (e.g., B.A., M.A./M.S., Ph.D.) from degree-granting colleges and universities, and your field of concentration. List chronologically, beginning with baccalaureate.

Degree	Year	Field of Cencentration

6. Please indicate if course work in foreign language(s) or foreign area studies were required in obtaining the degree(s) listed above.

Degree	Language Requirement		Area Studies Requirement	
	Yes	No	Yes	No

7. A. Which region, country or set of countries do you consider your primary current professional responsibility?

____

B. Please list the dates and duration of each visit you have made there over the course of the past five years.

Country/Region	From-To	Country/Region	From-To

8. As part of your formal education, did you take two or more substantive (non-language) courses specifically on the region(s) or country(s) of your current interest, as you defined in question 7? (Check one in each column)

A. While you were an undergraduate?	B. While you were a graduate student?
______ 1) yes	______ 1) yes
______ 2) no	______ 2) no
______ 3) does not apply	______ 3) does not apply

C. If you answered "yes" to either question 8A or 8B, please describe briefly the nature of your academic training on the region(s) or country(s) of your current interest.

____

____

____

9. Financial Aid: Please check all of the sources of fellowships or grants you have received:

______ 0) None
______ 1) NDFL, Title VI
______ 2) NDFL, Title IV
______ 3) Foreign Area Fellowship Program (Ford)
______ 4) Fulbright Hays - student
______ 5) Woodrow Wilson
______ 6) National Merit
______ 7) Social Science Research Council
______ 8) American Council of Learned Societies
______ 9) National Endowment Humanities
______ 10) National Institutes of Health
______ 11) National Institute of Mental Health
______ 12) Ford
______ 13) Rockefeller
______ 14) Carnegie
______ 15) Department of Defense
______ 16) Office of Naval Research
______ 17) National Science Foundation
______ 18) Fulbright Hays - faculty
______ 19) Guggenheim
______ 20) Office of Education
______ 21) Hazen
______ 22) Russell Sage
______ 23) Wenner-Gren
______ 24) Other, specify: ______________
______ 25) Other, specify: ______________

10. Please indicate the degree to which you feel your formal academic training in foreign languages and area studies has prepared you to carry out those tasks assigned to you which require foreign language and area studies expertise. (Check one)

________ Of critical importance
________ Of considerable importance
________ Useful
________ Of marginal utility
________ Does not apply

11. Please provide a rank ordering, in descending order of importance (from 1 for most important to 4 for least important) the factors which have contributed the most to your capabilities to carry out work requiring foreign language and area studies expertise. An "other" category is provided; if used, please rank order your responses from 1 to 5.

_______ Formal academic education

_______ Employer-sponsored educational programs, courses, etc.

_______ On-the-job experience

_______ Personal research, reading, travel, residence, etc.

_______ Other, specify:____

12. On-the-job Language Training: Please list the language training you have received, outside your formal academic education, at private institutions or in official programs such as the Defense Language Institute (DLI), the National Security Agency school, the Foreign Service Institute (FSI), etc. Also list the tested level of language proficiency you achieved, according to the following categories:

S2-/R2-, S2/R2, S2+/R2+ -- Limited Competence (+ or -)

S3-/R3-, S3/R3, S3+/R3+ -- Minimum Professional Proficiency (+ or -)

S4-/R4-, S4/R4, S4+/R4+ -- Full Professional Proficiency (+ or -)

S5-/R5-, S5/R5, S4+/R4+ -- Native or Bilingual Proficiency (+ or -)

Year	Language	Proficiency	Educational Institution

III. Language Proficiency and Usage

13. For the language(s) you now use or recently used professionally, what is your current tested proficiency rating? (S2-/R2- through S5+/R5+ as defined above)

Language	Rating	Date Last Tested	Not Tested (check box if applicable)
			☐
			☐
			☐
			☐

14. Please list below the languages RELEVANT TO THE AREA in which you have some competence, circling (e.g., ③) the degree of competence you have, regardless of your tested rating, according to the following scale.

1. -- Not at all
2. -- With some difficulty
3. -- Reasonably well
4. -- Well
5. -- Fluently

Language	Degree of Competence				
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

15. Please indicate your level of foreign language proficiency in the language of your primary professional responsibility, by checking the most accurate proficiency statements below.

Language ____________________

1. Not at all
2. With some difficulty
3. Reasonably well
4. Well
5. Fluently

--scale

To what extent are your foreign language skills adequate to:

	Circle Appropriate Number				
1) Read a foreign language newspaper?	1	2	3	4	5
2) Read a technical journal?	1	2	3	4	5
3) Write a simple letter?	1	2	3	4	5
4) Write an analytical article?	1	2	3	4	5
5) Engage in casual conversation?	1	2	3	4	5
6) Conduct in-depth field research?	1	2	3	4	5
7) Discuss an intellectually demanding professional subject?	1	2	3	4	5

16. For the same languages you have listed above, please indicate by checking (✓) all the boxes that apply the type of training you have had and by filling in the number of years of formal language training you have had.

	How Competence was Acquired				Amount of Formal Training
Language	Learned as a Child	Self Taught	Formal Study where Language Spoken	Formal Study In U.S.	List in Academic Year Equivalent*
______________					___________
______________					___________
______________					___________
______________					___________

* One year of intensive language instruction should be recorded as two years.

17. In your opinion, how essential for your professional purposes is a command of a language native to your region(s) or country(s) or primary interest? (check one)

______ 1) Do not really need it at all

______ 2) Helpful but not essential

______ 3) Important but can still do adequate work without it

______ 4) Impossible to work without it

18. A. When you are IN the region(s) or country(s) of your current interest, do you use a native language of that area either for speaking or reading? (check one)

______ 1) Almost all the time
______ 2) Fairly frequently
______ 3) Every once in a while
______ 4) Never
______ 5) Never been to the area

B. When you are in the United States, do you use the indigenous language(s) of your area of interest either for speaking or reading? (check one in each column)

During Working Hours	During Leisure Hours
____ 1) Almost all the time	____ 1) Almost all the time
____ 2) Fairly frequently	____ 2) Fairly frequently
____ 3) Every once in a while	____ 3) Every once in a while
____ 4) Never	____ 4) Never
____ 5) Does not apply	____ 5) Does not apply

C. If your formal language training was at a U.S. college or university, how well did it prepare you for later demands on your language skills? (check one)

______ 1) Not at all
______ 2) Somewhat
______ 3) Completely
______ 4) More than necessary
______ 5) Does not apply

19. In your professional activities, how often do you use a foreign language for the following tasks?

	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Does not apply
A. Translation or writing:				
B. Reading for background:				
C. Conversations with foreign nationals:				
D. In-country travel:				

IV. Use of External Sources of Foreign Language and Area Studies Expertise

20. Over the past year, what is the approximate number of occasions in which you or your office engage the services of individuals outside of the defense establishment with foreign language or area studies expertise, from the following sources, to supplement your in-house capabilities?

Source	Number of Occasions (in last year)
Universities and Colleges:	
Research/Consulting Organizations:	
Independent Consultants:	
Reservists:	
Other (please specify):	

21. Over the past year, how often did you attend conferences involving the scholarly community in areas of your professional interest, and to what degree did you find these conferences useful.

Attendance	Utility
________ 1) Frequently	________ 1) Highly useful
________ 2) Fairly often	________ 2) Somewhat useful
________ 3) Occasionally	________ 3) Of marginal use
________ 4) Seldom	
________ 5) Never	

22. Please list the names of the scholarly/academic journals to which you or your office subscribe and/or which you read regularly (related to your foreign area(s) of professional responsibility), and indicate the degree to which you find these publications useful from a professional standpoint.

	Utility (check one)		
Name of Journal	Highly Useful	Somewhat Useful	Of Marginal Use

23. In your own view, what are the five best books or articles on your area(s) or country(s) of current professional responsibility, which have been published in the past five years?

Title of Book or Article	Author (if applicable)

24. Please indicate the degree to which you feel that the quality of scholarly/academic writing on your area(s) or country(s) of current responsibility has increased or decreased over the course of the past ten years. (check one)

______ 1) Increased substantially
______ 2) Increased moderately
______ 3) Remained the same
______ 4) Decreased moderately
______ 5) Decreased substantially

25. Please indicate the frequency over the past year with which you utilized the resources of libraries of academic institutions (colleges and universities) and of other organizations outside of agencies affiliated with the Department of Defense. (check one in each column)

Academic Institution Libraries	Other External Libraries
______ 1) Frequently	______ 1) Frequently
______ 2) Fairly often	______ 2) Fairly often
______ 3) Occasionally	______ 3) Occasionally
______ 4) Seldom	______ 4) Seldom
______ 5) Never	______ 5) Never

26. In any average year, approximately how often do you contact individuals in the academic community to answer questions related to your professional activities? (number of occasions)

____

27. Do you feel constrained in consulting with individuals in the academic community. If so, what is the reason? (rank order)

______ 1) Possible academic hostility to DOD or to intelligence function
______ 2) They may not have clearances
______ 3) I don't know whom to call
______ 4) Other (specify)______________________________

28. What areas of foreign language and/or area studies competence, if any, do you feel your organization requires, but does not now have access to, from either internal or external resources? How important would you say these shortfalls are?

	Degree of Importance		
Required Area of Competence	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Of Marginal Importance

29. Looking at the academic/scholar community, what specialty(s) or knowledge-based activities on foreign language and area studies expertise, if any, do you wish were available and accessible to you and/or your office?

1) ________________________________

2) ________________________________

3) ________________________________

30. From your perspective as a working professional utilizing foreign language and area studies expertise, please describe briefly any changes you would like to see in the academic/scholarly community as they relate to training professionals in your area of interest.

OFFICE TITLE: TITLE:

PERSON INTERVIEWED: FUNCTION:

ECHELON (IF APPLICABLE) E.G., COMMAND, STAFF, SECOND LEVEL, THIRD, INDIVIDUAL ANALYST:

1. What is the operational purpose of your unit: e.g., Intelligence Analysis?________________________________

____

What sources (reference materials, instructions) do you use besides internal memoranda, field reports, reports from other agencies, FBIS and other intercept material, in English?

____

____

Does your office subscribe to foreign periodicals?__________

What proportion of your staff/you have job related language skills? At what level?______________________________

____

What proportion of the materials regularly examined in this office are in a language other than English?_______________

____

Is any language other than English necessary for the performance of this office's (your) mission________ desirable ________ marginal ________ virtually unnecessary ________

2. If greater language competence is desirable, what would you do if you had staff with high language proficiency; that is, how would that improve your ability to fulfill your mission? ____

____

____

3. What opportunities for study and travel do you provide staff for skill maintenance (area expertise or language)? __________

4. Could your staff ability to fulfill your mission be enhanced by travel or residence abroad; how? __________

By academic training? __________ If so, what kind--Service Institutions, other agency, outside academic? __________

By any particular combination of language or subject area (e.g., French and economics)? __________

5. How was your language and area-competent professional staff trained? In-House training _____ DOD Institutions only _____ Outside academic only _____ Combination _____ Other Government _____.

If in combination, how much in-house or other government training is normally necessary before your professional staff is qualified to work here? __________

How good are they when they come on board? __________

Would your staff be significantly more useful if they were trained differently? __________

If so, what fields, and where (i.e., DOD institutions, or outside)?____

6. What proportion of our professional FLAS expert personnel are uniformed military, civil servants, or other long-term civilian personnel?____

*A. How do you rate the reliability, sophistication and policy utility of the DOD Intel product, meaning projections and judgments which include political and economic considerations, in contrast to that of other agencies?________________________

The Service Intel product?________________________________

Are analytical shortcomings a result of: staff competence, internal compromises, other basically bureaucratic consideration?____

Do the best or most suitable officers and civilians seek Intel work?____

If not, what can be done so that more do:________________

What is being done now:________________________________

* Questions asterisked intended for senior end-users only.

*B. Geographically, could you rate capabilities according to (1) current need or emphasis (what is most important to have now) and (2) on-board quality. Please list them in order (for both): Africa, East Asia, Southeast Asia, Inner Asia, Latin America, Middle East, Western Europe.______________________

____

____

7. How do you provide for skill maintenance?
Periodic training; sabaticals; reliance on flow through of new and frequently reassigned military personnel; offer convenient evening courses?______________________________

____

____

PROJECTED NEEDS

1. What functional areas should your staff be familiar with (e.g., economics, political science, law, engineering, psychology, cultural anthropology)?______________________________

____

For what countries______________________________________

Any weaknesses____

What kind____

Which areas____

Do your current capabilities match your present requirements?

If not, where don't they________________________________

____

____

* Questions asterisked intended for senior end-users only.

2. How have geographic and functional requirements changed in the last ten years, e.g., from Southeast Asia-to-Southwest Asia-to-Latin America?____

____

Have these changes affected: Composition and staffing of your office ____

____

Number of people on board____________________________________

____

Quality and availability of the personnel you get __________

____

3. Are these changes continuing?________________________________

____

In what direction and for how long?___________________________

____

What does that imply for the needs of your office (e.g., more Pakistan-familiar engineers with a working knowledge of Urdu; more technology familar economists, with a background in USSR and Eastern Europe; drop the Southeast Asia expert, etc.)?

____

____

4. Can you distinguish between your office's short- and long-term requirements?____

____

Can your short-term needs be met from some existing external pool of talent? If so, what pool is that?____________________

____

As to your longer-term needs, are you confident they can be met (based on past experience) by the normal training and assignment pattern?____

____

5. Given the inadequacy of most future projections, how would you handle surge emergencies (e.g., a sudden 1965-style need for Southeast Asia hands)? From within the defense establishment? New slots? Existing, emergency-related reserve positions? __

____

____

If new slots, would you fill them with retirees, or outside talent?____

____

How long before outside talent could be brought on board to work, assuming a need to clear and process?____________________

____

6. How do you meet your needs for unusual languages or dialects? Train as the need arises? Maintain inventory of cleared personnel inside the defense establishment?____________________

____

____

*A. Are there regional and functional capabilities which you need and don't have in adequate numbers or proficiency (e.g., language-qualified analysts on the economics of Soviet Central Asia)? What are they; not necessarily the specific specialties, but the directions of interest--geographic, (e.g., Central Asia) or functional (economic effects of tech transfer)?____________

____

Can these future needs be served from within DOD or the Services (improved management of existing resources, changed priorities) or more, new personnel, or both?______________________________

____

What would you do to meet them?______________________________

____

____

RELATIONS IN ACADEMIA

1. What kind of outside (non-Government) help do you use? (University faculties, academic research institutes, stable of cleared consultants, specialized academic researchers, advanced graduate students, summer interns, consulting firms?)_________

____

____

How do you make contact?_____________________________________

____

2. Are you confident that you know where the kinds of outside talent you might need are located?_________________________

____

3. If you have used academic help and consulting firms or consultants, what distinctions would you draw as to: relevant expertise; timely availability; utility and quality of product?

____

____

4. If you have one, how much of your preference for consultants or consulting firms reflects: familiarity with individual

talents; corporate reputation; previous experience with the same contractor; easy access through familiar channels; no clearance problems?____

____

____

5. What do you need that the university world can provide (e.g., paper on Shia Islam; monograph on the social origins of Soviet astronauts)?____

____

Were you to order such studies now, how long would it take to procure them?____

Are improvements in the procurement process needed for greater use of external resources? (explain)_________________________

____

____

6. Again, if you prefer non-academic sources of assistance, or have used them more, does this preference reflect any residual expectations of anti-military prejudices?_____________________

____

____

Have you tested this sense, lately?__________________________

____

Are there ways to assure academics that a DOD request for assistance does not compromise their reputations for objectivity? Should one bother?____

____

____

Are there other barriers between academic and the defense community?____

____

What are they and what should be done to overcome them?_______

____

____

____

7. How can the academic community, and particularly its FLAS resources, be of greater service to the defense community?

____

____

Timely social science contract research?_____________________

____

Better training in spoken languages?_________________________

____

Talent pool for unexpected requirements?_____________________

____

If any of these (or other possibilities) strike you as potentially useful, how could DOD help implement, to assure effective service?____

____

____

8. The academic community produces a large number of foreign language and area studies specialists each year, but only a very small percentage of these people end up working in the defense and intelligence agencies. What changes, if any,

would you suggest for policies and practices on the recruiting side by DOD, on the one hand, and on the career counselling by universities on the other hand?______________________________

____

____

9. Can you think of new mechanisms (institutional or procedural which might facilitate the flow of people and information related to foreign language and area studies expertise between the defense and academic communities?________________________

____

____

____

10. Do you have any other advice?________________________________

____

____

____